

Month by Month, in every way, the Champion is getting Better and Better.

—Rev. R. M. Staveley.

VOLUME 29—No. 4

APRIL 1923

Continues *The Sermonizer, Student and Teacher, Preacher's Assistant, Preacher's Magazine, and Preacher's Ill* \$19
San Francisco
Theo. Sem.,
8) San Anselma, Calif.

THE BIBLE CHAMPION

ESTABLISHED IN 1889

Frank J. Boyer, Managing Editor and Publisher.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS—David James Burrell, D.D., LL.D., William H. Bates, D.D.
Leander S. Keyser, D.D. David S. Kennedy, D.D.

Contributing Editors—W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D., William Phillips Hall, H. W. Bromley, M.A., D.D.,
Edwin W. Caswell, D.D., A. William Lewis, A.B., B.D., Harold Paul Sloan, D.D., W. B. Riley, D.D.,
John L. Dickens, D.D., LL.D., L. Franklin Gruber, D.D., LL.D., Charles Calvert Ellis, B.D., Ph.D.,
William Harrison, D.D., Bishop William F. Heil, D.D., Dyson Hague, D.D., LL.D.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

The Uses of Adversity—A Modernist Creed—Intelligence Tests and
Preaching—A Repeating Critic's Epithet—A Pastoral Reminiscence—Dr.
Raven's View of Inspiration—Notes and Comments 185-197

THE ARENA

Historicity of Genesis III—The Riddle of Spiritism—Epistle to the Philip-
pians 198-217

THE CLUB

The Church and the Old Testament—*The Continent* Attacks the Book of
Daniel; Dr. Robert Dick Wilson Answers—Wesley, Toplady and Sanctifi-
cation—Were the Pastoral Epistles Written by St. Paul?—Immortality
—What John Saw—Professor Robert Dick Wilson and the Bible—Is the
Modern Mind Really Modern?—The Word Made Flesh: Immanuel
..... 217-235

THE SANCTUARY

Christ, the First Fruits 236-237

FLASHLIGHTS 238-239

PRAYER MEETING SERVICE

Love Triumphs—The Face of Jesus—Broadcasting Life—Faith Positive
..... 240-241

LIBRARY TABLE

Review of Recent Books—Additional Book Notes—A Rash and Foolish
Assertion 242-244

FRANK J. BOYER, PUBLISHER, READING, PA.

Price \$2.00 the Year

Canada \$2.25, Foreign \$2.35

Single Copy 20 Cents

Entered as Second-class matter, at the Post Office,
Reading, Pa., under act of March 3, 1897.

THE BIBLE CHAMPION

Official Organ of the Bible League of North America

Formerly the American Bible League

An Organization formed to promote a true knowledge of the Bible and consequent faith in its Divine Authority.

William Phillips Hall, President

Frank J. Boyer, Secretary-Treasurer

Important Instructions: All mail should be addressed to, and all Money Orders and Drafts should be made payable to, Frank J. Boyer, Reading, Pa.

Change in Address—It is very important that Old as well as New address be given. Always allow at least 10 days to make a change.

Expirations and Renewals—Your subscription expires with the month and year printed on your Address Label. When renewing please state that your remittance is for a renewal. We receipt new subscriptions by starting the magazine, and renewal subscriptions by changing your address label. A subscription blank enclosed in your magazine indicates your subscription has expired, and we earnestly solicit your prompt renewal.

Discontinuance—We find that many of our subscribers preferred not to have their subscriptions interrupted in case they fail to remit before expiration, therefore, by authority of the U. S. Postoffice Department, we can extend reasonable credit when necessary, and all subscribers are expected to notify us to stop magazine if it is no longer desired.

FRANK J. BOYER, Managing Editor and Publisher, Reading, Pa.

CHURCH FURNITURE
Pews, Pulpits, Chairs, Altars, Book
Racks, Tables, Communion Ware—EVERY-
THING. The finest furniture made. Direct
from our factory to your church. Catalog free.
DeMoulin Bros. & Co., Dpt. 79, Greenville, Ill.



Sermon Outlines

These Sermon Sketches are available not only for Revival Services, but also for the ordinary preparation for the pulpit. They are Suggestive, Helpful, Fresh Gems, and will prove very valuable to ministers in their study.

Sketches of Revival Sermons No. 4

Contains sixty full Sketches of Sermons, contributed by fifty different ministers, aiming at originality and suggestiveness of arrangement, price.....50c

Sketches of Revival Sermons No. 5

Are by Rev. Wm. J. Stevenson, D. D., singularly original, and suggestive; 60 full Sketches of Sermons, price.....50c

The Seed Basket

A collection of 300 Sermon Outlines, Seed Corns, etc., similar to Tool Basket.

100 pages, bound in flexible cloth, oblong, indexed thoroly for ready reference by subjects and texts, price.....50c

"It deserves its name. Open it anywhere, and you will drop on an ingenious arrangement of a subject, a happily selected cluster of Scripture texts, or illustrations for lighting up an address."
—Rev. F. B. Meyer.

The Tool Basket

A collection of 300 Sermon Outlines, Pegs of Thought, Sunday-School Addresses, etc., gathered from various sources and grouped together in convenient form for the express purpose of helping to fix upon some suitable subject, thus affording assistance in time of need and emergency.

100 pages, bound in flexible cloth, oblong, indexed thoroly for ready reference by subjects and texts, price.....50c

"Admirable; the sort of thing that is invaluable to busy workers."—Rev. Mark Guy Pearce.

Frank J. Boyer, Publisher, Reading, Pa.

You Can't Improve

The old historic method for bringing blessing to the households of faith that the family altar has always represented. Everywhere souls are hungry for the spiritual vitamins that shall give to the soul the health that means holiness. Intellectual husks aren't satisfying.

No revival of pentecostal fervor will ever come to the church until it shall begin at the family altar. A new day will come in religious achievement when age and sex have their spiritual needs met in the holy atmosphere that a household of faith alone can produce.

Modern conditions demand an adaptation of pastoral service to meet the problem of maintaining a family religious life. Many ministers are searching out ways of satisfying these needs of the Christian home.

Send 10c for the postage on a sample packet of literature, including a free copy of "The Christian Home Magazine" and a booklet "A Suggested Program for a Family Altar Day."

Address

THE FAMILY ALTAR LEAGUE

541 Marquette Bldg.

Chicago, Illinois

Rev. W. E. Biederwolf, President.

Rev. Wm. Matthew Holderby, Gen. Sec.

The Bible League of North America



THE Bible League of North America, then called the American Bible League, was organized in the year of our Lord 1903 to effect "the promotion everywhere of a devout, constructive study of the Bible, as a whole and in its various books and parts, by the common sense and rational, or truly scientific, method, and with the aid of all the light that can be thrown upon it from all sources, and the meeting and counteracting of the errors now current concerning its truthfulness, integrity and authority."

The second article of its Constitution declares: "It shall be the object of this League to organize the friends of the Bible, to promote a more thorough, reverential and constructive study of the Sacred Volume, and to retain the historic faith of the Church in its divine inspiration and supreme authority as the Word of God."

At the Second Convention of the League, held at Park Street Congregational Church, Boston, in 1904, the writer, among other things, said: "In the prosecution of its high purpose the League aims to avail itself of the coöperative assistance of the ablest and most highly accredited scholarship that the conservative school affords; and in its enterprise plans to give all sane and sound Biblical criticism its proper place.

"To search the Scriptures for the imperishable gold of God's eternal truth is indeed most Christly and commendable, and to devote oneself to such search in the spirit and with the methods of a truly reverent and scientific scholarship is but to yield obedience to the Spirit and teachings of our Divine Lord. For such Christ-like critical study of God's Word the American Bible League most strenuously stands.

"In the full enjoyment of that blood-bought liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, we joyfully engage in that most noble of all the undertakings of a truly Christian scholarship, the study of the oracles of the Most High; and thus devoting ourselves to the acquisition of a more complete knowledge of the words and will of God, we fear no damage to faith in the Divine inspiration, integrity, and authority of the blessed Book.

"We shall make no bid for the full acquiescence of a blind and unreasoning faith in the correctness of our conclusions, but rather, by the teachings of a scholarship of unchallenged ability, we shall endeavor to commend ourselves and our cause to the favorable judgment of all friends who acknowledge the supreme authority of our Lord Jesus Christ in all matters of faith and practice."

Although more than seventeen years have passed since the words just quoted were originally uttered, we have had no reason to change our mind, nor our position so declared.

Today, more than ever in the past, is the work of the Bible League called for, and it is cause for devout thanksgiving to our dear Lord that there still remain more than seven thousand who have not bowed the knee to the Baal of a false scholarship and a faith destroying criticism of the Word of God.

To that more than seven thousand we appeal to come up to the help of the Lord against the mighty forces of unbelieving and destructive scholarship, and to actively coöperate with our good brother, Frank J. Boyer, now General Secretary-Treasurer of the League, in his splendid work of carrying on the publication and distribution of the BIBLE CHAMPION throughout the land.

The names of George Frederick Wright, Luther Tracy Townsend, Herbert W. Magoun, David James Burrell, William H. Bates and many others who are contributing to the magazine assure us of the extraordinary value of the same in the vitally important work that is being accomplished thereby.

May all true friends of the Bible subscribe for the BIBLE CHAMPION and also secure its widest possible circulation among their friends and acquaintances, and may the blessings of our Lord Jesus Christ richly rest upon all who may send a favorable response to this appeal!

WILLIAM PHILLIPS HALL, *President*

Bound Volumes and Orthodox Pamphlets

Nothing offered on this page can be duplicated after stock now on hand is exhausted. We are closing out this lot at HALF and LESS THAN HALF ACTUAL VALUE. Everything offered here sent Prepaid

Collapse of Evolution, by Dr. L. T. Townsend

The new and enlarged edition is now ready to mail. It is a beautifully printed pamphlet, with bright, strong, cover, 64 pages. Orders for thousands of them were filled the first week they were off the press. Dr. Townsend deals our Evolutionists a crushing blow. Get yours—and order a lot to give to your friends.

Price 20c each; \$2.25 per dozen; \$17.00 per 100. Always sent prepaid in whatever quantities.

Look this List over---Order at once---All sent prepaid

Constructive Studies in Matthew, Dr. Gregory, 50c edition, now 35c each, or dozen for	\$2.50
Constructive Studies in John, Dr. Gregory, 50c edition, now 35c each, or dozen for	2.50
NOTE—West of Mississippi River price for above 2 pamphlets is 40c ea; or \$3.00 per doz.	
The Higher Criticism, Dr. Sharaton, 20c Pocket edition, now 15c each, or dozen for	1.50
The Higher Criticism: A Present Appraisal, 10c each, per dozen.....	.75
From Pulpit to Poor House, Dr. Hamilton, \$1.00 cloth edition, now.....	.60
Counterfeit Criticism of Scriptures, Dr. Hamilton, 10c edition, now 6c ea. doz.....	.50
The Editor in the Pulpit, Dr. Hamilton, 5c edition, now 4c each, or dozen for40
Letters on Higher Criticism, Dr. Ridout, 10c edition, 10c each, or dozen for.....	.75
Hume's Essays on Miracles and Studies in Theology, by Judge Lamb, 5c each, or dozen for40
Biblical Giving, Smith, 5c each, or per dozen50

Cloth Bound Volumes Sermonizer

\$1.75 each for years as fol.:

1911, 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916:

Cloth Bound Volumes Sermonizer

\$2.25 each for years as fol.:

1917, 1918.

Have nearly every number Sermonizer from 1910 to 1918, single numbers, which we will supply at 10c each. Ministers will find these numbers very valuable for pulpit preparation, as they contain only Homiletic helps — Sermons, Outlines of Sermons, and other Homiletic literature.

Cloth Bound Books by Dr. Townsend

Published to sell at \$1.00, \$1.25, \$1.50

Your choice at 50c—3 books for \$1.25

God-Man—Search and Manifestation

Sword and Garment

The Arena and the Throne

Cloth Bound Vols. Bible Champion

\$2.75 each for volumes as fol.:

Volume VIII—January to June, 1908

" IX—July to December, 1908

" X—January to June, 1909

" XII—January to June, 1910

" XIII—July to December, 1910

" XIV—January, 1911 to April, 1912

" XXIV—January to December, 1918

" XXV—January to December, 1919

" XXVI—January to December, 1920

" XXVII—January to December, 1921

" XXVIII—January to December, 1922

Single numbers Champion, any number previous to July, 1918, at 5c each, to close out. Any number from July, 1918 to date, at 15c each. Please note that we cannot supply numbers for full years for any year previous to July, 1918, but can supply any number, at this time, from July, 1918, to date, except June, 1920 number.

Cloth Bound Volumes Preacher's Assistant

\$1.75 each, for volumes as fol.:

Any year from 1889 to 1905—average about 450pp.

These volumes will prove a valuable addition to any preacher's working library. They are filled with available material for Pulpit preparation for ordinary and special occasions.

Single numbers of any we may have on hand may be had for 10c each. Try several numbers—you will find them valuable.

Cloth Bound Volumes Preacher's Magazine

Special Price \$1.00 each, Prepaid—Great Value

Complete set of 11 volumes, \$10.00, not prepaid. Each volume contains about 576pp, 6¼x9½ in. They sold originally at \$2.50 each, or \$21.00 the set, and are fully worth that price to any minister.

25c Religious Pamphlet Package

Send us 25c for a worthwhile package of timely Religious Pamphlets fully 50c worth, and more! Try one!

FRANK J. BOYER, Publisher, Reading, Pa.

THE BIBLE CHAMPION

Official Organ of the Bible League of North America

Volume 29.

April, 1923.

No. 4.

EDITORIAL

The Uses of Adversity

BUT, "does God send trouble?" Yes and no. All the ills that flesh is heir to are primarily due to sin; and Satan is the author of sin. It would be a great mistake, however, to suppose that God retired from the premises when Satan became the prince of this world. He is still the Almighty and, by that token, he is able so to rule and overrule that even the wrath of the rulers of darkness shall praise him.

Why then, if able to prevent it, does he permit his people to suffer? The question is as old as the history of man. Let Job and his comforters speak; and when they have led you through an interminable labyrinth of whys and wherefores and confusion worse confounded, bow low and listen to the Voice out of the whirlwind saying, "Who art thou that repliest against me? Be still and know that I am God!"

In the year 315 old Ignatius, the Bishop of Antioch, was led along the Appian Way in chains to die. It was the last day of the Saturnalia, the maddest of Roman carnivals. The galleries of the Colosseum were thronged with patricians, plebians and slaves whose appetites were whetted for blood. The lions were awaiting their prey. The old man fearlessly faced his doom, saying, "I am the Lord's wheat. If he will that I be ground this day by the teeth of lions into bread for his little ones, so be it!" The bolts were drawn and the lions were upon him; but, as calmly as if he were ministering at the altar, he sang his last Te Deum; "Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost; as it was in the beginning, is now and ever shall be, world without end!"

It is thus that the mills of Satan grind for God. The blood of martyrs has ever been the seed of the Church: and,—albeit we may not pry too closely into the state secrets of heaven,—we are here advised as to some of the reasons why suffering is permitted among even the most devoted servants of God.

It teaches them, better than they otherwise could know, that God is their Father.

If, coming upon a group of boys quarrelling in the street, you should see a man rush in and subject one of them to chastisement, you would scarcely need to be told that he was the father of that particular boy. Now turn to the Epistle to the Hebrews (12:5-9) and you shall find that incident translated into the terms of disciplinary providence:

"My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord nor faint when thou art rebuked of him. For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. If ye endure chastening God dealeth with you as sons; for what son is he whom his father chasteneth not? But if ye be without chastisement; whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards and not sons. Furthermore we have had fathers of our flesh who corrected us, and we gave them reverence; shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits and live?"

Another reason why God permits us to suffer because it *leads on to Character*. And it is only in the building of Character that we attain unto some measure of the greatness that God expects of us.

In the time of the Crimean War an officer in the English Army had in his command a dissipated sub-altern who was also his ward. The young man, when under the influence of liquor, was so insubordinate that not infrequently he ended up in the guard house. On

one occasion he reeled into the officers' mess and behaved so badly that his guardian then and there administered a thrashing and sent him to the hospital for repairs. A cruel sort of manhandling, do you say? But the youth never drank another drop. What would you have done? God knows when heroic measures are called for.

His severity is always kind. In the prophecy of Malachi (3:3) it is written, "He shall sit as a refiner of silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness." The picture here is that of a goldsmith who, having kindled the fire under his crucible, sits beside it watching for the moment when the surface of the molten metal shall reflect his face. When that supreme moment is reached the fire is quenched. God is such a careful watcher. He never suffers his people to be tried beyond that they are able to bear. He promises not to break the bruised reed or quench the smoking flax. His only purpose is to make the very most and the very best of us. This being so, why should we not kiss the rod?

Again, such disciplinary providences are designed *to fit us for greater usefulness.*

A quaint old writer says; "As when masons and carpenters do polish their stones and square their timbers with axes and other tools it is a sign that they have chosen them for building uses, whereas that which is untouched is left as refuse fit for nothing but to be cast into the highway or burned; so when the Lord doth square and polish us with troubles and afflictions from the knots of sin, it appears thereby that he hath made choice of us to be stones in the building of his spiritual house."

The teacher of a young American singer, who had just made her debut in Florence, on being asked if she had not acquitted herself well, replied "Yes: but she lacks the experience of pain. If I were a younger man I would pay my addresses to her, win her love, maltreat her and break her heart; after that she would sing like the proverbial lark with a thorn against its breast." A brutal sort of philosophy, you are thinking; nevertheless there is a tremendous truth at the center of it.

In one of the greatest sermons the world ever heard (John 15) the Preacher said "I am the true vine and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit, he taketh away: and every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit." Read on and you

will find the Preacher dwelling with insistent emphasis on the importance of "fruit," "much fruit," "more fruit." And this can only be accomplished by the use of the pruning knife. The vine bleeds but profits by it.

And thus the Father accomplishes his final and supreme purpose in the chastening, which is *to fit us for Heaven.*

In one of John's apocalyptic visions he saw a great multitude which no man could number standing before the throne arrayed in white robes and with palms of victory in their hands. "Who are these?" he asked; and a Voice answered, "These are they that came out of great tribulation, (literally, out of great harrowing,) therefore are they before the throne of God and serve him day and night in his temple."

It is not merely that our disciplinary sorrow rends the golden cords that bind us to the earth; by stimulating us to faithful service, they qualify us for an abundant entrance into that better country whereof it is written, "There his servants do serve him."

Have you ever seen an old Christian, who was apparently ripe for his translation to glory, and longed to be like him? But no amount of longing will bring that to pass. The aged saint has suffered: in evidence of that fact observe the furrows that adversity has plowed across his brow. Saints do not spring, like Minerva, full armed from the forehead of Jove. They are sanctified, as their Lord was, by suffering. This was in the mind of Milton when he wrote:

"Sweet are the uses of adversity!
Prosperity conceals our brightest ray:
As night to stars, woe luster gives to man."

Not long ago I visited a great factory in Richmond where a thousand colored hands were singing "Swing low, sweet chariot." On my asking the proprietor if singing did not distract them from the business in hand he replied, "Oh no; not that kind of singing. They work best when their religion gets hold of them. They learned their music in the house of their bondage. Watch them now: they are seeing the chariot of fire!" The besetting sin of God's people is spiritual indolence; and only the whip of scorpions can cure it. Drudgery and weariness vanish when we gaze upon the unseen and eternal. As I came away from the factory the hands were still singing:

"I looked over Jordan, and what did I see
Coming for to carry me home?
A band of angels coming after me,

Coming for to carry me home?
Swing low, sweet chariot,
Coming for to carry me home!"

And I thought of what Paul wrote, as he bore about in his body the marks of the Lord Jesus: "This light affliction, which is but for a moment—a moment only, an infinitesimal arc of the infinite circle of life—worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory!"

But whether the chastening of the Lord shall have its perfect work in us depends altogether upon how we receive it. So writes Paul, with his thorn rankling in his flesh: "No affliction seemeth for the present to be joyous, but only grievous; but in the end it worketh the peaceable fruits of righteousness *to them that are exercised thereby*." The word for "exercise" is *gymnasium*, i.e. the training of the gymnasium. And that is precisely the place which discipline fills in the philosophy of life; it trains us to "run with steadfastness the race which is set before us."

One may resent it, as did the wife of suffering Job when she bade him "Curse God and die." Not long ago I tried to comfort a bereaved mother whose only response was a moan, "O cruel, cruel God!"

Or one may submit in the spirit of the ancient Stoics who yielded to the inevitable because, "what can't be cured must be endured;" or of a fatalistic Indian tied to the stake who smiles amid the curling flames.

Or one may merely acquiesce in it, saying: "It is the Lord; he doeth all things well." This is better; but cold comfort after all.

Or one may glory in tribulation; because, as the Apostle says: "Tribulation worketh

patience, and patience experience, and experience hope, and hope maketh not ashamed." Here is the very summit of rightness with God; to be in such perfect accord with his gracious plan for our betterment that when under the harrow—so far from doubting or questioning—we joyously cooperate with him.

I have pointed out some of the evident uses of adversity; but there still remains a large residuum of mystery that calls for simple faith. Blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed.


"I know that trial works for ends
Too high for sense to trace;
That oft in dark attire God sends
Some embassy of grace.

May none depart till I have gained
The blessing which it bears,
And learn, though late, I entertained
An angel unawares.

So shall I bless the hour that sent
The mercy of the rod,
And build an altar by the tent
Where I have met with God."

It is a great thing to be a Christian, any sort of a Christian, even a *minimum* Christian who finds his chiefest joy in the assurance that he has made his own calling and election sure; but oh, to be a *maximum* Christian, that is a wonderful thing; to dwell in the secret place of the tabernacle of the Most High! For in the keeping of that holy tryst with love, one sweetly learns that "all things—pain and sorrow, loss of earthly goods, abandonment or death itself—"all things work together for good to them that love God."—*D. J. B.*

A Modernist's Creed

F course, we are interested in Sherwood Eddy's new creed. It is set forth in his new book, "Facing the Crisis," and has been republished as an editorial in a liberalistic religious journal. It goes without saying that it contains many true statements, whereof we are glad. However, it is clear that Dr. Eddy has deliberately aligned himself with the liberals in theology, whereof we are not glad, but are filled with deep sorrow and regret. He may not be as radical as some of the liberals, but he certainly belongs to their camp.

The creed before us boldly announces itself as "the faith of a modern Christian." May we

ask, What is there so remarkable about "a modern Christian" that he must have a different creed from the plain old gospel of salvation? Has he evolved into a new species of the *Homo sapiens*? May he not be only a reversion to an old type?

There is something invidious about this high claim to be "a modern Christian." It seems to imply a feeling of great superiority, a feeling that the "modern" man is a sort of superman, one who is much wiser than the people of past generations, and therefore is practically independent of the past, and is far in advance of other folk. It also seems to connote that those who hold to the old evangelical

faith are not "modern." Why the evangelical believer as well as the liberalist cannot investigate and master the great things of the present day is a mystery. Does he not have access to the same sources of information? Cannot and ought not the liberalists, since they call themselves Christians, find a more humble and less boastful cognomen for themselves? We certainly are all modern Christians in the plain and simple sense of the term "modern," meaning that we live in the present age. But we certainly cannot accept Dr. Eddy's creed as our own, and therefore we say that the title he has chosen is wrong; it is not the faith of a modern Christian, but only the faith of that class of modern people who think they know a great deal more than other people.

What has thus far been said is validated by Dr. Eddy's definition of "a modern Christian." He says "a modern Christian" is one who "seeks to find truth rather than to defend tradition." Have we not said that the men who style themselves "modern" always assume superior airs? Besides, Dr. Eddy's definition is an ugly fling at orthodox Christians, for it implies that they are not concerned for the truth, which is an inexcusable blunder and an ungenerous judgment. We wish we could see in his creed the obvious marks of unadulterated truth. To our mind, much as we regret to say it, his statement is full of errors and goes limping with fatal omissions of vital Christian truths, as we shall show a little further along.

Dr. Eddy also declares that "a modern Christian" is one who "accepts the method of evolution as discovered by modern science as God's working in the natural world." That proves precisely what we have said again and again in these columns: let a man become a liberalist in theology, and every time he turns to evolution as his guide and idol, although he ought to know that the theory has not been scientifically proved. Following are more of this "modern Christian's" high and mighty claims: the "modern Christian" is "one who adopts the principle of historical criticism, seeking by patient inductive study to ascertain fact at whatever cost." But wait a moment: the man who "adopts the principle of historical criticism" as his norm does not go into his investigation in an unbiased frame of mind, but with certain subjective presuppositions which unfit him to find "fact at whatever cost." Read the books of the men who claim to employ the so-called "historical" method, and see whether it is not so.

We wish our readers to observe the humble and modest spirit of the self-knighted "modern Christian" in the following from Dr. Eddy's creed: "By the creed of a modern Christian is meant, not some imposed belief, not some second-hand tradition which one must repeat, not some barrier of prison bars beyond which one may not pass, but the glorious adventure and growing achievement of experience; the vital and enlarging grasp of life."

We will not even characterize such language and claims as sophomoric, because we think it would be an unkind reflection on the sophomore classes of our colleges. We rack our brains in vain to cipher out who the pitiable people are who are behind those terrible "prison bars" and who "must repeat" those "second-hand traditions." There is one thing at which the "modernist" is an adept, and that is the art of drawing caricatures of orthodox believers.

Let us look at the creed itself. Dr. Eddy's statement of the meaning of the death of Christ is a poor shift, with all its high-sounding and fluent phrases; it is nothing more or less than the old "moral influence" theory of the atonement held by Abelard (1079-1142) and Horace Bushnell, which even the latter partly renounced later on in his life. On some other vital points Dr. Eddy's statements are vague and ambiguous, so that one wonders whether he really means to accept the evangelical doctrine or not. Very much, we must confess, do we dislike this Janus-faced type of "modern" theology. If men who try to give us new creeds now-a-days cannot make clearer and more clean-cut declarations of doctrine than the ancients did, but rather obscure them, we cannot see that the attempt spells "progress."

It is not with pleasure, but with profound regret, that we call attention to the fatal omissions in this so-named "faith of a modern Christian." Not a word is said in it about the following fundamental doctrines: the virgin birth of Christ, His resurrection, His ascension, His second coming to judge the world, the Trinity, the Holy Spirit, original and actual sin, regeneration, justification by faith, salvation by grace, the immortality of the soul, future rewards and punishments, the resurrection of the body, baptism and the Lord's Supper. Reflect for a moment, all ye people of serious mind, what must be the spiritual poverty of a "modern Christian" who deliberately or even inadvertently omits all these vital Biblical doctrines from his creed! Nothing

could be sadder than this pitiful exhibition of a limping faith.

His statement regarding the Bible points two ways, and contains invidious jibes at the orthodox doctrine, which it misrepresents, as is the usual method of the liberalists. All evangelical scholars believe that Biblical inspiration "is vital, not mechanical." None of them believe that it was "mechanically controlled, so as to crush the full freedom of human expression." No; nobody believes such doctrines; the accuser is setting up a man of chaff, and then pluming himself on his skill in knocking him down. But the secret of this modernist creed is exposed in its initial viewpoint; for in his introduction Dr. Eddy asks

this question, to which his creedal statement is intended to be an affirmative answer: "Can a modern Christian form a working faith of his own in harmony with modern science and philosophy?" With such a merely human basis it is no wonder this "modern Christian" does such sorry work at creed-making. We are glad to say that the evangelical creeds are drawn, not from "modern science and philosophy," but from the Word of God; hence their rounded, rational and all-inclusive character. But this "modern" creed—we cannot see how it can be satisfying even to a "modern Christian." If it is, we are compelled to say that he is very easily satisfied.—*L. S. K.*

Intelligence Tests and Preaching

IT is confidently maintained by most of those who have given the matter special attention that tests have been devised that enable us to ascertain with approximate accuracy the intellectual capacity of an individual.

These tests have come into prominence through their use in connection with the army, over one million, seven hundred thousand men having been classified and assigned to their respective tasks, whether as officers or privates, largely on the basis of the results obtained. To appreciate the significance of the results obtained by applying such tests to the men drafted for the army, we need only remind ourselves of the fact that these men were a somewhat favorable sample of the population of the country as a whole. Keeping in mind that these tests are designed to ascertain not the supply of knowledge an individual possesses, but his *intelligence*, his capacity to acquire knowledge, and to use the knowledge he has acquired, these tests, as applied in the army, support the notion that the great majority of our citizens are possessed of but small intelligence. According to these tests, the average mental age of our people as a whole is only thirteen or fourteen years, over seventy millions being under the mental age of fifteen. There are, however, some sixteen and a half millions who are of higher than average, nine millions who are of superior, and four and one-half millions who are of very superior intelligence. An amazing fact indicated by these tests is that there are some ten millions of our population who do not develop beyond the mental age of ten.

We have called attention to these widely

published results to raise the question of their bearing on the task of the preacher. If these results be even measurably accurate, it is evident that the preacher must be constantly on his guard against preaching over the heads of most of his audience. Possibly we have here the explanation of the fact that not infrequently adults say that they get more out of the sermon for the children than the one for the adults. We are far from supposing that the average intelligence for the country as a whole as indicated by the army tests affords an accurate measure of the average intelligence of the preacher's hearers. Unquestionably, in our judgment, the average intelligence of those who frequent our Protestant churches is far above that of the average intelligence of our citizens as a body. But whatever the allowances that may be warranted when judging of the average intelligence of the preacher's audiences, it must be admitted that, if the results obtained in connection with the army are even measurably accurate, the average intelligence of such audiences is very moderate. No doubt, in nearly all of our audiences there are a considerable number of those of superior intelligence, but we may be sure that in most instances there is a much larger number of those who are "slow to understand." Whether it is possible to make the same sermon meet the needs of all our hearers is a question; but, at any rate, it is incumbent on the preacher to see to it that his ministry as a whole meets the needs of his people as a whole, and not merely of one intellectual section of his people. The task is a difficult one, but it is imperative that it be performed.—*D. S. K.*

A Repeating Critic's Epithet



ONE of the repeating critics is Professor Albert C. Knudson, who wrote the book entitled "The Religious Teaching of the Old Testament." In this book the critical assumptions of the Cheyne-Driver school are all taken for granted. With him it is all settled, and there is no need of further argument. Just assert it over and over and over again and again, and by and by people will come to think it must be so merely on the ground of constant iteration!

A friend tells us that Professor Knudson was in Los Angeles, Cal., not so very long ago, delivering some addresses. He seemed to have a special dislike for the Fundamentalists, and kept calling them the "Funny-mentalists." It may be that the epithet was witty; we do not profess to be a judge of such sallies of humor. But the epithet bent our mind into a number of interrogation-points.

The Fundamentalists believe that the whole Bible is God's Word, a holy revelation from God, given to men to guide them in the way of life to an immortal destiny: what is there about people who hold such a belief that makes them "Funny-mentalists"? The Fundamentalists believe that Christ was the eternal Son of God incarnate, and therefore the true Redeemer of the world; why should they be called "Funny-mentalists" for holding such a

belief? The Fundamentalists believe that our gracious Redeemer took man's place before the holy law of God, and made atonement for man's sins, so that he could be saved, and that in an ethical way: is there anything "Funny-mentalistic" about such a sacred belief? The Fundamentalists, interpreting the Bible in an honest way, accept the doctrine that the incarnate Son of God will come again to this earth to judge its inhabitants and to decide their eternal destiny according to the law of equity: was it kind, apposite and reverent to dub them "Funny-mentalists" for cherishing such a faith based on God's Word? The Fundamentalists accept the Biblical teaching about the origin of man, namely, that God created him in His own image, endued him with rational personality and free moral agency, and placed him in a garden, where he had a chance to develop moral and spiritual character and attain his high purpose: is there anything so very "Funny" about such a conception of man that its sincere exponents should be called by a derisive epithet?

All these queries are to be answered in the negative. But here is another question: Was the use of the epithet by a theological teacher in a discussion of religious problems a becoming and dignified one? This last question is to be answered in the negative also.—L. S. K.

A Pastoral Reminiscence

That "Awful" Third Chapter of the Westminster Confession of Faith



PASTOR, returning from a meeting of his Presbytery, was joined by a lawyer, who was his Sunday-school superintendent, as the train passed through the county-seat. The lawyer was born and reared a Methodist. He had a brother who was a prominent clergyman in that denomination. The layman became a Presbyterian by marriage, took his place in the work of the church, and had become an acceptable superintendent of the Sunday-school, which brought him into close relations with his pastor.

The two men were on excellently familiar terms, and the lawyer, to make it interesting for his minister, began an assault on the West-

minster Confession of Faith, almost as virulent and vindictive as assaults by modernist or "liberal" Presbyterian ministers now-a-days.

For an issue, the pastor asked: "What particular thing in the Westminster Confession do you object to?"

Said the lawyer: "That awful third Chapter, for instance, which treats 'Of God's Eternal Decree.'"

The pastor took the Confession from his satchel and, handing it to his companion, said, "Please be specific".

The lawyer, reading of the predestination unto everlasting life of "some men and angels", seemed to have quite a rise of temperature as with incisive emphasis he read sec-

tion "IV. *These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished*". And turning excitedly to his pastor, he said: "Do you believe that?"

"Certainly", said the minister; "what is the matter with it? Use your brains a bit, and tell me".

"Matter!" exclaimed the lawyer. "Matter enough, I should say. The idea!" But nothing more definite could be elicited.

The pastor took the initiative, and continued: "You believe that some will certainly be saved?"

"Yes," was the reply.

"And you believe that some will certainly be lost?"

"Y-e-e-s", was the reluctant admission.

"Well, if some will certainly be saved, then the number of the 'some' can be expressed in definite mathematical terms?"

"Of course".

"And so of the lost?"

"Yes".

"Now", said the pastor, "if a mathematically definite number of persons are saved—

and God, being omniscient, must know that exact number—there won't be any more than that number saved, will there?"

"No".

"Nor any less?"

"No".

"Then this certain number 'cannot be either increased or diminished,' can it?"

"I don't see how it can be," said the lawyer, with some confusion.

"Well", urged the pastor, "won't you please tell me what is the matter with this section? And let me suggest to you that every other section in the Confession can as conclusively and satisfactorily be dealt with. Those Westminster divines were not fools nor slow of heart to believe".

The lawyer looked out of the window and remarked, "It is fine weather we are having now".

The case seemed to be effectually closed.

The Westminster Confession of Faith is popularly known as "Calvinistic". It may be well to note that what is called the "Calvinistic System" is contained in Chapters III, V, IX and XVII. All the rest may be accounted the common heritage of the Orthodox of whatever denominational name.—*W. H. B.*

Dr. Raven's View of Inspiration

MANY of our readers, no doubt, are aware that Dr. John H. Raven, Professor of Old Testament Languages and Exegesis in the Theological Seminary at New Brunswick, N. J., is a most capable exponent and defender of the evangelical faith. His work on "Old Testament Introduction, General and Special," would be hard to duplicate. If any one wants to read a thorough-going and constructive work, and at the same time a complete refutation of the repeating critics, he should get Dr. Raven's book.

Just now we are interested in one of his latest writings in a recent number of a contemporary magazine, in which he defends in a sane and capable way the Messianic character of the prophecies of the Old Testament, especially the saying of Job, "I know that my Redeemer liveth." It is especially noteworthy in these Sadducean days that he advocates the full-toned inspiration of the Holy Scriptures regarding prophecy. While he does not overlook the human element in prophecy—and nobody ought to do so—he regards the divine

element as the chief matter. So refreshing are some things he says that we think them worthy of reproduction here:

"And, after all, the vital question in the interpretation of Scripture is not, What did the human author mean by his words or understand them to mean? but, What did the Spirit of God mean by them? It is essential to the very idea of inspiration that the human author should speak better than he knew. The Spirit of God who guided him to use such language meant more by the words than Job meant and more than he understood. So it is written that the prophets 'searched what time or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glories that should follow them' (1 Pet. 1:11). The prophets tried to understand the meaning of their own words. The thing they were searching for was not their own meaning in the words; they knew that very well. They were searching for the meaning of the Spirit. And that is the thing which we should always seek for in Scripture."

Then in reference to Job's exclamation, "I know that my Redeemer liveth," our author adds these enlightening remarks: "It seems incredible that Job did not see something of the distinction in God which to us is implied so clearly in his language. Perhaps this is because it is so difficult for us to shut out of our minds for the moment our New Testament knowledge of the Trinity and put ourselves back in Job's place. But even if we are mistaken, even if Job understood nothing of this

distinction, meant no such thing, had not taken the first step on the long road which led to the doctrine of the Trinity, the Spirit of Christ who was in Job did point to the Trinity, and so these words for us are an adumbration of the Trinity."

There writes a scholar who holds the true view of the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures in its full tonality, nothing wavering, nothing abating. We thank God for Dr. John H. Raven!—L. S. K.

Notes and Comments



THIS is always so—when a man substitutes his own opinions for the teaching of the Holy Scriptures, he grows one-sided and narrow. He seizes upon one thought, becomes obsessed with it, tries to explain the whole universe by it, and forgets that the world is made up of a multitude of related and essential facts and factors. This thought has been suggested to us by reading the criticisms of Dr. Harold P. Sloan, in his excellent book, "Historic Christianity," on Dr. W. D. Hyde's liberalistic book, "The Five Great Philosophies of Life." Dr. Hyde professes to be one of the "larger-view" men. His treatment of Christianity, however, travels on a narrow-gauge roadway. He tries to make love the whole sum of the Christian religion. Says his critic: "He does not treat the ethic of love as one great Christian element; he reduces the whole of Christianity to this one idea." How much broader is Biblical Christianity! Of course, it emphasizes love, and even teaches that it is the greatest virtue; but it never teaches that it is the *only* virtue. It gives to all the virtues and qualities, both divine and human, their proper and proportionate place in its all-inclusive system. The man who accepts the whole Bible at its face value cannot be narrow; he cannot be a man of one idea. The Bible will not let him.

*

It is such a pity, this habit of calling everybody "ignorant" who does not agree with one's own opinions. The stock-in-trade of infidels and liberals is just that fashion. When they cannot answer the arguments of the conservative believer, they resort to ridicule and call him "ignorant." Some one has sent us a series of editorials printed in a "liberal" magazine which bear out the above statements. All through the article the

"Modern" advocates are praised for their intelligence and scholarship, while all the conservatives are virtually classed as ignoramuses.

In speaking of the fundamentalist, the editor says: "His beliefs are founded upon an almost inexplicable lack of intelligence, and are often held by ignorant religious fanatics." Why should the conservative believer be so sadly uninformed? Does he not live in this present age? Cannot he, like others, go to the college and the university? Does he not have access to libraries? What sources of knowledge are accessible to the liberalist that are not also accessible to the evangelical scholar? How does it happen that there is a monopoly of intelligence on one side? And yet it seems to us that the editor in question has no right to throw stones. Note what a profound and childish lack of knowledge the following statement shows. He says that "the liberalism of the Modernist" "saves him from such crass folly as believing that God wrote the Old Testament with His own hand, with His own pen on a particular piece of parchment." Now no one ever believed that! A Sunday School boy of twelve knows better than that. In view of such egregious blundering, we are disposed to say very gently that people who live in such brittle and transparent glass houses are the last persons who ought to throw brickbats.

*

Here is another *indicium* of the aforesaid editor's lack of technical knowledge. He says: "The cheering part of the Modernist's *Credo* is his belief that God is not only transcendent, but immanent." Is not this writer aware that the above *credo* has always been held by evangelical Christians? The Bible teaches God's omnipresence. There is no indication anywhere in the Bible that God ever absented Himself from the world. And evangelical

believers accept the Bible, and always have; therefore they have always believed in God's transcendence and immanence. Did not Christ say, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world"? And have not conservative Christians always believed that? Where was this critical editor born and bred, we wonder? Our quotations from this writer prove that at least one liberalist does not have a "corner" on the brains of the age.

*

God forbid that we should boast of superior scholarship. Such boasting is unseemly, utterly incompatible with the Christian grace of humility. But anent the letter that Dr. Percy S. Grant wrote to Bishop Manning, in which he ventilated his doubts about many things in the Bible, such as some of the miracles, we cannot help wondering in what seminary he might have received his theological training. Every one of the difficulties trumpeted abroad so loudly by him have been dealt with in all our up-to-date and thorough-going theological seminaries, so that at least the middlers and seniors are familiar with them and have had them explained to their satisfaction. Can it be possible that Dr. Grant has just been awaking out of his slumbers and become aware of difficulties that have been dealt with by Christian apologists ever since the days of Justin Martyr? What does he suppose Christian scholars have been thinking about all through the centuries? Why, he can find these alleged objections treated effectively in any standard work on Christian apologetics. We recommend to this sciolist in theology the following well-known works on Christian evidence: J. H. A. Ebrard's "Christian Apologetics;" A. M. Fairbairn's "The Philosophy of the Christian Religion;" G. P. Fisher's "The Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief;" James Orr's "The Christian View of God and the World;" E. Y. Mullins' "Why is Christianity True?" W. St. Clair Tisdall's "Religio Critici;" W. H. Turton's "The Truth of Christianity;" W. H. Johnson's "The Christian Faith Under Modern Searchlights," and J. A. Faulkner's "Modernism and the Christian Faith."

*

In line with the general thought of this series of paragraphs, we find something too good to keep in Dr. H. P. Sloan's refreshing book, "Historic Christianity and the New Theology." It occurs in connection with President Hyde's braggadocian claim that "the majority of well trained scholars" can no longer accept "antiquated formulas;" by

which he means the historic creeds of the Christian Church. To this claim Dr. Sloan replies: "Nor can we forbear to record our amusement at this constantly recurring boast of the 'liberals' that they have cornered the brains of the world. These men who are so rebellious against the authority of the Bible are forever insisting on the authority of the so-called scholarly consensus. Of course, they insist both on determining which noses are to be counted in making up the consensus, and in doing the counting. . . . But no matter! Go on, brothers; the rest of us have become accustomed to your humble boasting, and it has lost its impressiveness. To tell you the blunt truth, we have so often found that there was behind it neither facts of science nor searching philosophical analysis, that we have come to look upon it as something used in lieu of these." There may be some scorn in these remarks, but it certainly is deserved.

*

Dr. William D. Hyde, President of Bowdoin College, in the book above alluded to, makes *love* the center and circumference, the sum and substance of Christianity. Let us see how his preaching agrees with his practice and *vice versa*. He is advocating the religion of love over against historic Christianity—remember that. Here is what he says: "Christianity of this simple, vital sort is the world's salvation. Criticized by enemies and caricatured by friends; fossilized in the minds of the aged, and forced on the tongues of the immature; mingled with all manner of exploded superstition, false philosophy, science that is not so, and history that never happened; obscured under absurd rites; buried in incredible creeds; professed by hypocrites; discredited by sentimentalists; stereotyped by literalists; monopolized by sacerdotalists,—it has lived in spite of all the grave-clothes its unbelieving disciples have tried to wrap around it, and holds the key of eternal life." Is not that a lovely string of epithets on Christian love by a man who professes to make love everything?

*

"Academic freedom!" That seems to be a kind of talisman with some people now-a-days. If they belong to the state universities, they mean that they want "academic freedom" for themselves in order to teach irreligion—in the name of evolution and destructive criticism—but they do not want others to have "academic freedom" to teach the Bible and the Christian religion! Is not that a queer and one-sided kind of *Lehrfreiheit*? If these voluble ex-

ponents of "academic freedom" are on the faculties of Christian institutions, they want freedom to eat at the well-provided table of the church, while at the same time they are sapping the very foundations of the church that established and supports those institutions. The only way to have absolute "academic freedom," and at the same time be *ethical*, is for the heretics to build their own colleges and universities at their own expense and sacrifice; then they will have a perfect right to teach what they please and to any crowd they can collect.

*

To show that the whole Bible is an organism, and not, as some people hold, a bundle of disconnected fragments, we quote from a fine book, "The Gospel in Genesis," by Eleanor Herr Boyd: "All the roots of truth are in the Old Testament, and they are they which produce the flowers and fruits of the New. As well chop a tree in half, and expect fruit from the severed top, as to expect any one to understand the truths of the New Testament when severed from the roots of the Old."

*

The middle verse of the Bible is Psalm 118:8: "It is better to trust in the Lord than to put confidence in man." That verse makes a real center around which all truth may revolve. It furnishes the reason why we have more confidence in the statements of the Bible than in the guesses and lucubrations of poor human wisdom, however wise it may think and proclaim itself to be.

*

By the way, how does the evolutionist answer the questions, Why was the universe made and why is it here? Can he give a better reason for its existence than that taught in the Bible? Or does he think that it has just happened to be, and therefore has no definite purpose? The Bible indicates that man and the universe were created for a great, righteous and eternal purpose—the glory of God Himself and the felicity of all rational and sentient beings. Can the naturalistic evolutionist figure out a better *raison d'être* for the universe? If so, let him present it to the world for consideration. But if he has nothing definite to offer on this vital problem—yes, vital to human welfare here and hereafter—let him be quiet until he has more knowledge. More than that, if he has no definite solution of the reason of the universe, how can evolution be such a mark of "progress" as he tries to make out? Will some one stand up fair and square and tell us how civilization

and human well-being are going to be advanced by getting everybody to believe that man has descended from a bestial stock instead of having been originally created in the image of a good and holy God?

*

It seems to be impossible for a "modern" theologian to be logically consistent with himself even in the same production. One of these rationalists recently published an address in which he advocates the evolutionary hypothesis. He takes the part of those would-be scientists who, he says, "account for the heavens and the earth by process instead of fiat, by evolution instead of immediate creation." Yet afterward he says of Christ: "He is the supreme personality of history, and therefore the supreme miracle of history." How can that be? How can evolution perform a "miracle"? How could God perform a miracle and yet work according to the law of evolution? Why did evolution perform its "supreme miracle" 1900 years ago? Oh! these vocal advocates do not even know the meaning of evolution!

*

A book recently appeared entitled "The Simple Gospel." In many ways it is a good book, but an acute critic makes the following just comment upon it: "The simple gospel here set forth is not the gospel of redeeming grace, but the gospel of social progress drawn from the Sermon on the Mount." It is always so—whenever a man mistakes a part of the gospel for the whole gospel, he becomes narrow and one-sided. If we shall preach a fully rounded gospel, a gospel that will meet all the diversified needs of the human soul, we must know the Bible and know it whole.

*

The editors of this magazine, principal, associate and contributing, believe with all their hearts in both the Word Written and the Word Incarnate. They never try to divorce them, nor set the one over against the other. Both are needed in order to have the Christian faith in its full tonality. The Word Written tells us infallibly just who the Word Incarnate is, so that we need not mistake the true Object of our trust. The Word Incarnate gave us the Word Written by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and is the infallible God and Saviour depicted in the Word Written. There is no bibliolatry in this view; for true Christians are sufficiently enlightened not to think of worshipping the Written Word, but to worship only the Incarnate Word revealed therein. If you receive a letter from

your father, you are not so simple-minded as to mistake the letter for your father; but you accept the letter as giving you a true message from your father. It is all as plain and easy as it can be. Not even a child needs to misunderstand.

*

Let us bear several fundamental things in mind: A mutilated Christianity is not Christianity; a distorted Christianity is not true Christianity; a fragment of Christianity is not the whole of Christianity; a "minimum" of Christianity is not Christianity in its full-toned power and grace; a bisected, trisected or dissected Christianity is not the organic, living and life-giving Christianity of Christ and His apostles; lastly, an attenuated Christianity is not plenary Christianity, nor is some substitute or counterfeit the real thing.

*

The trouble with human rationalism is its constant tendency to become narrow and one-sided. It so often mistakes a part for the whole. It seeks to interpret the universe by means of a section of it and a meager basis of facts. These reflections are suggested by Dr. Fosdick's attempted definition of Christianity, which, he shouts aloud again and again, "is a life." Thus he mistakes one element of Christianity for the whole of Christianity, and that is one of the fatal fallacies of present-day rationalism. It cannot see Christianity and see it whole. It is evident that our Lord Jesus Christ would not underwrite so fragmentary an interpretation of the religion which He gave to the world. Did He make Christianity to consist of only one element? He surely did not. He combined faith, doctrine and life, making faith and doctrine basic and therefore the source and spring of the true religious life. Let us see. In His last commission to His apostles, He said (Mark 16:15, 16): "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned." That is clear, profound and all-round teaching; but it is most unlike Fosdick's one-sided preaching. Note: the apostles were to go forth and preach? What were they to preach? Surely the doctrines which Christ taught them. What else could they preach? What were their hearers to believe? Certainly the doctrines preached to them by Christ's commissioned servants. What would follow the acceptance of those doctrines? They would be saved—that is, the true spiritual and eternal life would be imparted to them. There we

have the true, all-sphered principles of Jesus Christ—but they are not the principles of present-day rationalism, which picks out a fragment of Christianity and mistakes it for the whole. May the good Lord deliver us from the one-sided and superficial treatment of our holy religion in vogue among the rationalists of our day! A carved up Christianity will be an anemic Christianity.

*

One of the thriving villages in Northern New York is Carthage, Jefferson county. The papers thus report: "The members of the Congregationalist and Universalist congregations at Carthage, at a numerously attended meeting last Friday evening, voted practically unanimously to consolidate the two church societies." Why not? Do not birds of a feather flock together?

*

A common error of the self-styled "modernists" is the conception that the New Testament is simply the outcome of the experience of the early disciples of our Lord. They simply wrote it out of their subjective feeling; in some way it bubbled up from the depth of their "subconscious mind." This is a superficial interpretation. Suppose we examine it somewhat searchingly. Says the apostle John: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." How could John have gotten that truth merely out of his subjective experience? If he just manufactured it in that way, how do we know that it is true? If the statement is true, the only way by which John could have known it was by special revelation from Christ Himself or from the Holy Spirit whom Christ poured upon His church. When it was directly and divinely revealed to the apostle, then, and only then, could it become a subjective experience to be written in the inspired gospel record. Take another example. Once Christ prayed thus (John 17:5): "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." Could John have experienced the fact in that statement unless it was revealed to him directly and *verbatim* by Christ Himself? Surely John was not present in heaven "before the world was." So let us not confuse the issue by asserting that the Biblical writers simply produced the Bible out of their experience; for that does not tell the whole truth, but only a part of the truth. If they wrote according to their experience, it was because the Holy Spirit first begot that experience within them, and gave them a spe-

cial revelation of those truths which they never could have known and experienced otherwise.

*

'Good! good! we say for Professor Jay William Hudson, Ph.D., of the Department of Philosophy in the University of Missouri! From his recent book, "The Truths We Live By" (D. Appleton & Company, New York), we give a quotation which we are glad to underwrite: "What we are accustomed to call the great verities are of immense practical value; a faith in them that takes no account of modern scientific thought will end in inevitable doubt; and, while the agnosticism of science is sound as far as science goes, it is not final, since it happens that the logic of science is not the only kind of logic there is. The difficulty is, that most men of culture tend to think so. The chief reason for the prevalent skepticism concerning the fundamental problems is the widespread belief that the ranges of natural science and of human reason are synonymous; that not only what science demonstrates is true, but that what it cannot or does not demonstrate is either beyond decision or is thereby disproved. One of the aims of this book is to show the utter falsity of this position." On this statement an acute writer remarks: "The reviewer wishes to bear testimony that the author has accomplished this aim, and in so doing has put many under obligation to him." What we need today is such solid books on philosophy, just as we need more solid books on theology and religion.

*

Here it is again, just as you would expect! The loud-voiced scareheads of the Monday morning newspapers shriek out the following announcement: "Dr. Grant declares the story of Adam and Eve and the garden of Eden a fable—Defends Sunday theater performances and movies." Just as you would expect: almost always when a man begins to tamper with the Bible, he loses his fine ethical sense. Liberalism in doctrine leads to liberalism in practice. The theaters and movies run the six week-days, usually far into the night, and then they grab Sunday too. Other legitimate and needed businesses must close up on Sunday. The church, which is established to lead people to worship, to cultivate the spiritual faculties and to teach the highest principles of morality, asks for only one day in the week; and then it must come into competition with worldly shows which appeal to and cultivate the same worldly spirit that has had the lead all week. In the name of con-

science, law, order and equal justice, we ask whether that is right. And then we are wondering what could have been the logical connection between the story of Eden and Sunday theaters and movies. It would seem to us from the reports that Dr. Grant's sermons are only a hodge-podge of inconsequential and dogmatic assertions. There is no evidence in them of deep, clear, judicial and logical thinking. He is sensational, but not sound. Again, as might be expected as the tap-root of his liberalism in theology and ethics, he has come out as an advocate of evolution. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

*

The United Presbyterian per capita gift for missions and benevolence is \$15.56; the Moravian average, \$11.67; the Southern Presbyterian, \$10.41; the Canadian Presbyterian, \$7.75; the Northern Baptist, \$7.16; the Congregational, \$6.36; the Methodist Episcopal, \$6.23; the Reformed Church in America, \$6.04; the Episcopal, \$5.52. The Presbyterian is \$5.46.

*

Roger W. Babson, who is considered the foremost financial expert in this country, has an article, "How Ministers Should Handle Their Money." He says: "Have no part in new promotions. Never buy bonds on property 'to be constructed.'" The holder of this pen has a keen business son, one who is auditor of National concern that has a capital of several millions, and he gives this advice: "Never buy stock of a company that has not for five successive years paid regular and earned dividends." If the writer had had and heeded the foregoing advice he would not be lamenting the loss of \$5,700.00 in stocks that the Kaiser's paper has knocked out, and which he can ill afford to lose. He has found that the safest and best investments are farm mortgages.

*

Somehow we have gotten the idea that if any one profession understands a case at issue, it must be a lawyer. For this reason we are always reassured when a lawyer gives a clear cut decision concerning a matter at issue in the CHAMPION, and are glad to pass it on. This is what Attorney F. M. Longley writes us: "I just read the February BIBLE CHAMPION, handed to me by my former pastor, Dr. Vaughn, and was so charmed with it that I am sending you herewith my check for \$2.00 for a year's subscription. Dr. Bates surely foreclosed the mortgage on Dr. Fosdick. The arrogant assertions of these Modernists of

ape ancestry deserve rebuke since they seek to destroy the faith once for all delivered to the Saints—not delivered to college professors and evolutionists—but to the Saints. I am greatly pleased with the CHAMPION and wish it could be placed into every Christian home in America." Surely *your* friends would be as happy to subscribe as Mr. Longley was if only *you would hand them a copy and invite them!* Try it!

*

Minnesota has organized an Anti-Evolution League, the purpose of which is to force the teachings of the evolutionary hypothesis from the public schools, and to lend all possible aid to evangelical denominations in ridding their schools of the same pseudo-science, proceeding upon the basis that parents and tax payers have some rights in the educational process, and if they do not want their children taught a falsehood in the name of science, at their expense, they have a perfect right to protest it. The League adopted the following resolution:

PREAMBLE. As American citizens we believe in the complete separation of church and state, and are opposed to religious teaching in public schools—higher or lower.

As those who wish to teach Christianity must support their private schools, we therefore believe it just that those who wish to teach anti-Christian theories should be forbidden to use tax-supported schools for propagating their opinions.

WHEREAS, the Evolutionary hypothesis has come to be accepted by many American teachers and is increasingly taught in the Public Schools of Minnesota, including high schools, state normals and state university, and

WHEREAS, this hypothesis, after more than sixty years of study, remains wholly unproven, and has increasingly shown itself to be a foe to the Christian faith, denying as it does the veracity of the Scriptures. Therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That we, citizens of Minnesota, representing thousands of our fellows, hereby utter our protest against this propaganda of infidelity, palmed off in the name of science, and we call upon the Trustees of the State Institutions to demand of teachers a cessation of such teaching, and the removal from our schools of such textbooks as favorably present the same.

This is done in the interest of true science vs. science falsely so-called, and in the interest of fair dealing. If the Bible is not to be made a matter of study in our public schools, by inalienable rights of Christian citizens, it shall not be made a subject of scoffing on the part of tax-paid teachers.

It is held that the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States "Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion" was never intended to be interpreted that the State should become sponsor

for irreligion; and that it is manifestly unfair to impose taxes upon Christian tax payers to inculcate teaching inimical to the Bible and destructive to civilization itself.

* * *

"Today--God's and Mine"

It isn't the experience of today that drives men mad. It is the remorse of what happened yesterday, and the dread of what tomorrow may disclose. These are God's days. Leave them with him.

Therefore, I think, and I do, and I journey but one day at a time. That is the easy day. That is the man's day. Nay, rather it is our day—God's and mine. And while faithfully and dutifully I run my course, and work my appointed task on that day of ours, God the Almighty and All-loving takes care of yesterday and tomorrow.—*Robert J. Burdette.*

* * *

A Cure for Doubts

Sorely troubled with doubts in his school days that celebrated Swiss Christian, Dr. Merle D'Aubigne, the historian of the Reformation, determined to go to his old teacher for help. The wise old man refused to discuss the doubts, saying: "Were I to rid you of these, others would come. There is a shorter way of destroying them. Let Jesus Christ be really to you a perfect Saviour, the Omnipotent Son of God; His life will dispel the darkness, and His Spirit will lead you into all truth." The veteran was right. He saw what a fatal habit young D'Aubigne was acquiring; and he knew that the glorious Sun of Righteousness alone could scatter the clouds that make so many Christian lives feeble and faint and unfruitful.—*Theo. L. Cuyler, D.D.*

* * *

Assurance

A man who is filled with the Holy Spirit will have an undoubted assurance of his sonship; moreover, he will be cleansed from the power and love of indwelling sin; he will be tempted, but will find that his inner nature is like a tinder-box which has become damp. The devil will still try to strike his matches upon him, but the man will not respond; he will be so saturated with the Holy Spirit that there will be no response as in other days.—*F. B. Meyers, D.D.*

THE ARENA

Historicity of Genesis III

By Professor L. S. Keyser, A.M., D.D., Springfield, Ohio

A Constructive Argument

First Article



THE historical character of the Biblical account of the origin of sin as given in Genesis iii. has often, in recent times, been called in question. Some men, even, who desire to be considered conservative and who are willing to be counted among the "traditionalists," are averse to committing themselves definitively to the historicity of this part of the Holy Bible. There is much diversity of view, however, among those who doubt its historical veracity, some holding it to be myth, others legend and tradition, and still others parable or allegory. Among those who regard it as actual history there is, so far as we know, practical unanimity.

The writer is happy to acknowledge that he accepts the Biblical account of the first transgression as veritable history; as something that actually occurred here on this mundane sphere. Without calling in question the sincerity of those who take a different view, he wishes to present, in a couple of articles, the positive reasons for the conviction he cherishes. Before doing so, however, he will try to show the untenable character of the opposing theories.

I.

1. There is the view that the story of the Fall of man is a mere myth, like the myths of the Babylonians, Greeks and Romans. Without dealing with the origin, philosophy and *raison d'être* of mythological lore, our main purpose will be to indicate the logical inferences that must follow if this Biblical story of the Fall and its consequences belongs to the order of myths.

If it is nothing but a myth, it cannot be accepted as a true account of the genesis of sin in the world. No one places historical reliance on mere myths. What follows, then, from this premise? Simply and plainly this: no one knows how sin entered the world; the whole question is thrown into the region of obscurity. If we cannot accept the Biblical ac-

count as historically true, and that because it seems to be unreasonable, we surely must reject the mythical and legendary accounts given in the heathen systems, which are altogether fantastic and oftentimes extremely childish and absurd. So, on this theory, we are simply left to the uncertainty of human speculation as to how sin came into the world.

And yet sin is an outstanding fact in human experience and history. Its reality is acknowledged everywhere. There is not a nation or tribe or individual that does not have some sense of sin and guilt, and that cannot see with intuitive vision the terrible consequences of sin. All peoples, too, believe that man's attitude toward sin will affect his status, not only in this life, but also in the life to come. Perhaps the most perplexing question with the vast majority of people in the world, whether they acknowledge it or not, is to get rid of sin, to be freed from its dominion, cleansed from its defilement, and saved from the punishment due its commission. Now, does it seem to be reasonable that, if God has given us a revelation of salvation from sin, He would leave us in total darkness as to the genesis of sin? According to the Bible, the only purpose of the plan of redemption through Jesus Christ is to save the people from their sins and restore them to the righteousness of God. Over and over again the Bible condemns sin; exhorts people to seek salvation from it; even teaches that the eternal and only begotten Son of God came into the world to redeem the world from sin. All this being true, how could God leave mankind in total darkness on the problem of the rise of sin? Surely if He did that, we might well and justly accuse Him of remissness. However, on the other hand, if the Genetical story is true history, all is clear, consistent, organic; we know just how sin came into the world; we know, too, precisely what is its remedy. Do some men prefer obscurantism to perspicuity, darkness to light?

Again, many of the critics, especially those who wish to be regarded as "evangelical," and yet who contend that the Genesis story of the Fall is mythical, asseverate again and again

that the *religious* teaching of the Bible is true and divinely inspired, so that we can confidently rely upon it even for our salvation here and hereafter. We should like to ask them whether the Scriptural account of man's first transgression of God's holy law is not religious. What is the very essence of true religion? Is it not to get rid of sin so that communion with the holy God may be re-established? The critics—that is, the so-called “mediating” critics—tell us that God gave us an infallible revelation of the plan of redemption, and He gave it in the Bible. Will any one tell us, then, why God gave to the world an infallible revelation in a book that is filled with all sorts of errors; so mixed it up with erroneous and childish myths and legends that it takes a Higher Critic, versed in Hebraic, literary, historical, and archeological lore, to separate the infallible truth from the puerile errors, and especially why He permitted to be placed at the beginning of His Book a number of narratives that read like history and yet are not history, thus deceiving millions of people of simple faith and upright lives who read and believe the Book He gave them? Still more, if God gave an infallible revelation of redemption in Christ, why did He permit Christ Himself to refer to the story of Eden as if it were actual history? And if God had anything to do with the inspiration of Paul, why did He permit him to make such an egregious blunder as to refer to Adam as an actual historical person and to his sin as an actual historical occurrence (Rom. 5:12-19; 1 Cor. 15:21,22)? The Adamic sin is also referred to as actual history in 1 Tim. 2:13,14. Christ's clear references to Genetical narratives are found in Matt. 19:45 (where He bases the doctrine of monogamous marriage on the original creation of male and female, one of each sex), and John 8:44 (where Christ evidently refers to the first temptation in Eden). If in the last cited passage Christ does not refer to the transaction in Eden, then our Lord also must have joined the obscurantists in His teaching. (With John 8:44 compare 1 John 3:8.) Now, our point is, if Christ made a blunder in referring to Genesis I and II., He cannot, after all, be an infallible guide and Saviour, and therefore the critic's logic breaks to pieces on the rocks of a fallacy.

However, if you accept the Old Testament narratives as veritable history, all is clear, and you have God doing the right, just and reasonable thing—giving to mankind an in-

fallible revelation of both sin and redemption in the midst of actual historical settings. If the religion of Christ is anything distinctive at all, it is a *historical* religion, with its feet on the ground, connected with man just as he is here on this mundane sphere, in the midst of physical, historical and psychical realities. “Godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come” (1 Tim. 4:8). It is both earthly and heavenly; it is all-inclusive; it is not visionary and utopian; it is both subjective and objective; it does not disconnect with nature and history, but maintains relation with them vitally and organically. Those who wish to separate the historical from the spiritual in the Scriptures are one-sided teachers, divorcing religion from reality and making it hazy and mystical. The Bible reveals a sane, sober, practical religious system, avoiding worldliness on the one side and false mysticism on the other.

Our conclusion is that, if the Genetical account of sin is a mere human myth, the trustworthiness of the Bible is invalidated right at the beginning. Then how are we to know that its scheme of religion and redemption is not mythical also? Besides, if sin did not come into this world according to the Biblical narrative, how did it originate? If its origin is wrapped in obscurity, the profound doctrines of Hamartiology and Soteriology are lost in the mists of mere speculation.

2. Another critical conception of the story of man's Fall in Eden is that it is mere legend, tradition, folklore. This is not quite so wild a view, because legend may have some natural basis of truth, which may simply be modified and decorated from generation to generation.

Still, practically the same objections obtain here as with the mythical theory—that is, the legendary hypothesis destroys the trustworthiness, and hence the true divine inspiration, of the Biblical record, leaving us again in darkness as to the origin of evil and sin; and, making a lame Hamartology at the beginning, it causes Hamartology to go limping in its entire course. If we do not know how sin got its start, how are we to know what is to be its end? A clear Hamartiology postulates a clear redemptive process, and *vice versa*. If the legend of the Fall had a kernel of truth, which was subsequently mixed with many errors by accretions, then who is to tell us what that kernel of truth is? If it be said that the kernel of truth is that man disobeyed the commandment of God, and thus brought sin into

the world, we would simply ask, In what way did he disobey God? What was the form of the temptation and what the act of disobedience? Here the answer must either be that no one knows or the critic must make surmises and guesses. In the latter case, we cannot see why the Biblical story is not as reasonable as any guess of the critics.

As is well known, the so-called "mediating" critics—among them may be mentioned Robertson Smith, George Adam Smith, Driver, Marcus Dods, Kent, Mains and McFayden—contend that their theories do not destroy or invalidate the inspiration and integrity of the Bible. In his "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament," Dr. Driver protests almost pathetically that his method of dealing with the Bible does not invalidate its inspiration, but rather puts it upon a firmer and more rational basis. This he says in the introductory part of his work. Straightway in the body of the book he proceeds to show that Genesis I. and II. cannot be accepted as true history because they contradict each other; the first chapter gives one account of creation, the second chapter another which is very different; *ergo*, these accounts cannot be true accounts; one or both must be erroneous. And yet he had previously protested that his theories do not in the least affect the doctrine of Biblical inspiration! So it follows that the Holy Spirit must have inspired the first chapter, and then immediately contradicted Himself in the second! Great is the Diana of the Historical Criticism! We would beg to know what kind of divine inspiration that would be. The fact is, as any one can prove in a very short time, these critics do not treat the Old Testament books as if they were truly inspired of God, but as if they were purely human documents, drawn from human sources. We wish therefore that they would not try to walk on both sides of the fence at the same time. More than all, if Genesis I-III, is packed with human errors, how can it be divinely inspired?

Sometimes the query is made: Are not these critics sincere? Is it right to question their sincerity when they assert that their views do not destroy the inspiration and authority of the Bible?" We reply that we are not calling their *sincerity* in question; we are calling their *logic* in question. It is not ours to judge men's motives. God only can judge men's purposes and sincerity. All we can do is to expose their lame reasoning, and show the inevitable conclusions to be drawn from

their premises. And so we say plainly that, to make the Biblical narratives mere human legends, is to undermine the doctrine of the divine inspiration of the Bible.

But some one exclaims: "Could not God inspire the legends and folk-lore of the Hebrew people?" Certainly He could. But if he inspired them, they must be true, not false and erroneous, and therefore we would simply have to accept the historical reality of the Biblical records. In that case it would be using words disingenuously to call such records human legends; we should frankly give them their correct designation, namely, inspired history. We maintain that the Holy Spirit would not inspire a document that is mixed with a lot of human errors and contains only a remnant of truth.

3. The next view we shall examine is that the Biblical narrative of the Fall is an inspired allegory. This seems to be rather a popular view among the liberal scholars of the day. It has been shown again and again to be untenable by conservative Biblical scholars, but the liberalists keep on repeating it as if no refutation had ever been made.

Instead of quoting authorities, let us look into the real merits of the allegorical or parabolic hypothesis; let us turn upon it the searchlight of reason. If the Bible story of the Fall is a parable—it is rather a brief story to be called an allegory, though the argument would be the same if we used that term—is it a good one? Is it one that is worthy of the inspiration of the Holy Spirit? Are the points of comparison lucid? Is it presented in the parabolic—or allegorical—form, so that no one in reading it would be likely to mistake it as meant for history? There is no doubt even in the intelligent child's mind that Nathan's story of the ewe lamb or Christ's story of the prodigal son is a parable. On the face of them they bear the hall-marks of the parable. The circumstances in which they were spoken indicate plainly, unmistakably their figurative character. Is the same true of the Genetical narrative of the Fall? Is the story so told and so environed as to show plainly that it was meant by the writer to be a piece of fiction pointing a moral? We have never heard of any one who mistook Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress" for literal history. But is it not a patent fact that the vast majority of people who have believed the Bible in the past have thought that Genesis III. was historical, and that even today most Bible believers think it is a narrative of fact? If that is so, as it is,

this story must be a very poorly constructed parable. He is a poor rhetorician who does not make his meaning and purpose clear; or else he is a clever trickster, purposely disguising his real intention. So we must say that if the Holy Spirit is the author of this story, and it is a parable, He must be a very poor rhetorician; or else He—but we forbear carrying out the other alternative.

If this narrative is a parable, what are the specific points of comparison in it? Are they clear and unmistakable, as ought to be the case in a piece of imagery? We have no trouble in catching the point in Nathan's parable, or in the parables of the prodigal son, the sower, the lost sheep and the lost coin. When Christ feared His disciples might not discern the true teaching of His parables, He gave them the interpretation, and thereby proved that He was a true teacher. But this story of Gen. III.—is its interpretation clear? For example, in every well-constructed piece of imagery most of the *foci* of the picture plainly stand for some truth in the moral and spiritual realm. In the Fall story what does the garden itself stand for? Will the critics tell us? Does it mean that our first parents—or the original progenitors of the human race—lived in a beautiful garden spot somewhere on the earth? If so, then we have a parable in which the garden stands for its literal self, and that is one of the most astounding pieces of rhetorical somersaulting ever performed. On the other hand, if the original human pair were a couple of ape-like creatures living in a wilderness where life was hard and existence a severe struggle, then the parable is not *apropos*, but is actually false to the facts. Again, there were all the animals in the garden, which were brought to Adam to be named; what do they represent if this story is a parable? Or were they only allegorical animals? Our first parents were permitted to eat of all the trees in the garden save one. What do those fruit-trees stand for in this so-called parable? What is the specific truth to which they are relevant? Perhaps they were only allegorical trees! If so, what kind of trees are allegorical trees? And how could any sane rhetorical piece of writing make real trees represent allegorical trees? The forbidden tree, with its attractive fruit—what is the specific point of comparison here? The Bible story is detailed in this place. The tree "was good for food;" what does that mean in the allegory? It "was a delight to the eyes;" what is the analogue in that instance?

It was a tree "to be desired to make one wise;" another point to be elucidated in this allegorical *regime*. The parabolists should also point out the analogy in the following cases: Adam and Eve were ashamed after they had eaten of the prohibited fruit; they made aprons for themselves; they went and hid themselves when they heard God coming; they blamed another party, both of them, when they were accused; they were driven out of the garden; they were punished with toil and childbearing. Here are many details wrought into this "allegory." They must each of them have some pertinency, or else they are idle ornamentations that simply weight down the "allegory" with useless lumber, and make it a labyrinth instead of a luminous similitude. Bunyan's allegories are masterpieces of pictorial writing in comparison with this mixed, obscure, enigmatical "allegory" of Genesis. And yet the critics try to make us believe that it is "*divinely inspired allegory*"!

Perhaps the proponents of the parable theory will accuse us of trying to make a figure of speech "go on all fours." Not at all; but we do honestly think that an allegory ought to have at least *two* feet to walk on. The difficulty with this critical theory is that the "allegory" has too many minutiae that have no pertinency to the facts in the psychological sphere, and therefore as an allegory it is a poor shift. Æsop's fables are far ahead of it. Christ's parables are luminous with spiritual meaning. Every one can see the main *foci* of the illustration in all these admirable pieces of rhetoric. All Christ's parables are constructed on truly literary lines.

But now let us look at the one point where an analogy *might* be seen in this so-called "parable"—that is, where one might be discerned, not spontaneously and easily, but after considerable mental effort. The point is this: the whole incident of the temptation might stand for a *subjective psychological experience*. That means the experience was only in the minds of our first parents. In some way—no one knows how—the suggestion of evil came into their minds, and they entertained it, and thus they fell into sin.

Let us just analyze that proposition for a moment. Would our first parents have had any comprehension of such an abstract matter as this interpretation would impose? Would they have known what was meant by the "subjective" and "objective"? What idea would they have formed of a "mere inner psychological experience"? True, we believe they

were good and pure, and had a fair practical knowledge—enough to know that they should obey their God and Maker; yet who could ever suppose they were versed in the modern sciences of psychology and metaphysics? If they had such knowledge, and knew that there never was a real garden, a real tree, a real serpent and a real ejection from Paradise, nothing but a “subjective psychical experience,” it seems strange that they never told their children and children’s children the truth about the occurrence. Nor is that all. How could the people of that olden time, the childhood of the human race, have understood such abstract matters? How much less could the primitive man, little better than a chimpanzee, according to the evolutionists, have had the least conception of the meaning of an “inner experience”? Now, if they could not have understood the abstract statement, how could they have discerned it in the “allegory” that the critics think God gave them? What good would such an “allegory” have done them if they could not understand its purport? Or if they could have understood what was meant by an “inner psychical experience,” why did God mix it with an “allegory” at all, and especially one with so many irrelevant details? No; we contend that if Gen. III. is an allegory, it is a very confusing one, and its intended points of comparison are extremely far-fetched. There is no clear *tertium comparationis*, as there must be in every well-constructed parable.

Here is another difficulty: Supposing the Genetical story to be a parable, representing a subjective experience only, what was the special temptation that came to the primeval pair? In precisely what form did it come to them? Who or what was their tempter? What was their first act of disobedience? Was it only a vague inner movement of the soul, leading to no overt act? Or was there an overt act? If so, what was it? Did Adam swear, or lose his temper, or beat his wife, or did she lose her self-control and give him a “certain lecture”? Or did they eat of some fruit that was forbidden? Do not think that these are puerile questions. Men and women sin in these common and concrete ways today, and we look upon them as ethically wrong and sinful in God’s sight. But if Adam and Eve committed some overt sin such as we have mentioned above, they might just as well have sinned by eating of the forbidden fruit. It would have been absurd for God to inspire an allegory in which one overt sin was made

to do duty for another sin of the same kind. Thus we see that the allegorical view creates more difficulty than it removes. And, worst of all, it casts reflection on the goodness and wisdom of God. We shall endeavor to show presently that the historical method obviates nearly, if not quite, all these difficulties.

4. Another view that we think untenable is that sin had its origin in the primitive animalism of man. This is the theory proposed by evolution. In evolving from his animal status by a slow and painful process, there came a time when man first got an inkling of moral reality and obligation; his conscience began to make feeble efforts to perceive and sense the right and wrong; in other words, to discern moral distinctions—though, of course, this crude animal-man could have had but a very dim idea of what that meant. But in that dim paleolithic or paleontological age, man permitted his natural animalism to get the better of a higher moral impulse, and thus he “fell.” Not only that, but all his posterity went down with him. What the nature of his first sin was the wisest savants cannot tell us, nor do they venture a conjecture. You cannot lay your hand on anything concrete according to this view any more than according to the allegorical theory.

What is to be said about man’s fall through his primitive animalism? In the first place, it assumes precisely what is still to be proven, namely, that the theory of man’s evolution from lower forms of life has been scientifically proven. It is far from proven. Indeed, philology, history, archeology and comparative religion prove incontestibly, to the minds of many of the best scholars of the day, that man did not come up from the brute creation by a process of natural evolution. As Dr. Orr pithily said in his great book, “The Christian View of God and the World,” it will be time enough to give up the creation view of man’s origin when the opponents have clearly cited one concrete instance in which a pagan race has evolved into a civilized people without being touched by some outside moral and spiritual force.

However, in this thesis we cannot go into the argument concerning evolution. This is what we wish to say: If man’s sin is the result of his primitive brutality, then God is the author of sin; for He must have given man the very animalism that weighted him down for millenniums; must have foreordained the process whereby man ascended in this slow and painful way. If man yielded to the over-

whelming brute nature that he had borne for ages, while his moral nature was just coming into vague reality, then we say that God not only caused sin, but did not give man a fair chance. Man's animal nature must have been strong; his moral powers extremely feeble. Then if God did not come to him with a clear revelation and command, and give him special moral strength to fight down the animality of his inborn nature—and evolutionists will not admit such supernatural aid—we declare again and again and again that God did not give the first man a fair chance. The vernacular of the day would put it, "a square deal." A thousand times would we prefer the method depicted so simply and graphically by the writer of Genesis.

This crude and degrading theory of animalism also commits a fundamental ethical error; it posits evil originally in matter, in the body. That was the error of Plato and the Manicheans, which was condemned and confuted long ago by all thorough-going ethicists. Mere physical evil and suffering might have their origin in matter; moral evil *never*. But moral evil, not physical evil, is the great crucial fact in the world's history and experience. And moral evil can have its genesis only in a free, self-conscious personality. Therefore the Bible is ethically right and most profound when it indicates in Gen. 3:1-5 that the tempter first injected doubt into the mind—the *psuche*—of the woman, and only after that did she commit the overt act. Some vigorous and fundamental *ethical* thinking is a most wholesome discipline, and will save men from all these crude mechanical, materialistic, and deterministic theories of moral reality.

II.

Thus far we have been dealing with our subject negatively; now we shall endeavor to show by a positive presentation that the historical view of Genesis III. is the most reasonable and the only adequate one.

1. First, the original progenitors of the human family, wherever they dwelt, must have been *real* human beings. They could not have been mythical, allegorical or legendary beings. As real human beings, they must have had bodies; hence they must have lived somewhere on the earth, walked on the ground, and eaten of the fruit of the soil. They could not have walked on allegorical ground or subsisted on legendary fruit. They must have also had enough mentality to take care of themselves, gather food, and otherwise provide for their

subsistence. This agrees with the realism of the Genetical account, which tells us that Adam and Eve lived in a real earthly locality. So this Bible story is realistic; it is not far up in the air; it bears strong marks of versimilitude.

2. The primeval ancestors of the *genus homo* must have been moral agents. Their descendants are moral agents, and of course only moral agents could beget moral agents. Science itself, as well as common sense, would teach that the moral could not evolve from the non-moral. If it could, it would be a case of water rising higher than its source, which is scientifically absurd. Therefore our primitive ancestors, being moral agents, must have been so created and so environed as to give them a fair chance to exercise and prove their moral agency. They could not have been *forced* to do right or wrong, or their free moral agency would have been destroyed. They must have been free; else they would have been mere automata, not moral beings, not persons who had the power of choice. On the one hand, they would not dare to be weighted down with animalism, for that would have overborne their wills on the side of wrong; neither would it have been right to place them in a locality that made life too hard on them to develop their moral and spiritual natures. On the other hand, their condition could not have been wholly without some trial or test; for then they would have had no opportunity to exercise and discipline their moral powers.

Now, weigh these natural and ethical considerations well, and see whether you can figure out by any kind of ingenuity a more fitting congeries of conditions in which our first parents could have lived and unfolded their moral and spiritual life than those pictured in Genesis II. and III. There all the circumstances were precisely right, not idealized and made unnatural. Ethically considered, the primeval pair should have been placed in a garden, not in a howling, noisome wilderness, jungle or arid desert. Just supposing that God is good and loving and rational, as the critics themselves teach, would He not have been likely to deal with the first human beings just as is delineated in Gen. II. and III.? Then why refuse to accept the Bible way? Why seek for some other way that cannot be discovered and proved by any amount of research and speculation?

3. Since the progenitors of the race must have been real human beings, placed in a real

natural environment, and also real moral beings, and not mere animals or automata, they must have had the opportunity to choose between right and wrong. Therefore they could not have had absolutely unlimited freedom in the paradisaical garden. Suppose God had told them they might eat of every tree, and do just as they pleased in every respect, how could they have been free moral agents, after all? You see, morality always connotes an opportunity to make an alternative choice. Either that or no morality. If the caviller should object by asking, "Why did God make man a free moral agent at all?" we would reply, that is not a german question just now; we know that God *did* make the first man a free moral agent, for we, his progeny, are such beings. Whether we like it or not, we must put up with what is, and so we know that God has made man a moral being, not a mere machine. The crucial point is not to find fault with what is, but to see whether we cannot find a rational account of the nature and origin of moral agency and of the coming of sin into the world; for that sin is here is another patent, undeniable fact. Besides, the man who finds fault with God for creating moral agents proves by that very token that he would prefer to be a happy animal or automaton rather than a moral agent, and that is not very complimentary to his moral perceptions and development. After all, whether we understand it or not, moral and spiritual excellence is the greatest and noblest thing in the universe, and every right-minded man in the world will admit it. Coerced goodness is a very low grade of goodness. A good, virile course in Christian ethics would, no doubt, be profitable to the thinking and living of moral weaklings.

So it follows by the logic of ethics that a moral test was necessary in the garden of Eden. There had to be at least one prohibition there, one opportunity to choose. What should be the form of that test? This leads to the next consideration.

4. The forbidden tree, called "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil," must now come under review. Was it a real tree or only a symbolical tree? On the hypothesis that it was a symbolical tree, the Biblical narrative would be a freak in literature—a story that tells literally about real human beings, in a real garden, amid real animals and trees, and then suddenly, right in the heart of the narrative, introduces a figurative object, and that without one hint of a change in the style

of the narration! This would be beyond belief even for a merely human composer; how much more incredible if it were inspired of God!

But let us only assume for the time being that this inhibited tree was a real tree, and see how natural and rational the story is; how it harmonizes with the very nature of things as we know them today and as they have been throughout all human history. Our first parents must have been dual beings just as we are. They were both physical and psychical; composed of body and soul. With their bodies they were organically connected with the natural cosmos, just as men are today. With their minds or souls they had communion with God and each other, just as men have today. Soul and body are joined organically in human beings. They are distinct as entities indeed, but are so constituted that only in organic union are they in their normal and God-intended condition. In the original state of integrity, as created by the Almighty, no doubt body and soul fitted each other in the most perfect way, so that there was no schism between the *psuche* and the *soma*. Even now they are so intimately conjoined that whatever affects the one affects the other. Inner joy, and especially ethical joy, causes the body to be sprightly and wholesome; mental grief makes the body droop and wither away. So bodily health gives vigor to the mind, while physical disease always interferes with vigorous mental action. In the state of integrity the union of man's two parts must have been perfect.

This being so, namely, that man was composed of both body and mind vitally united, the test of his moral agency, in order to be inclusive of his total being, should have been of such a character as to integrate into both parts of his dual nature. Think for a moment: if the test had been only subjective and psychical, it would have touched only one section of his corporate personality; it would not have made appeal to man as an integer. More than that, then the test would have come to him in a different way from the vast majority of the tests that come to men today. That would have made the first man a sort of mythical being, not a natural man like the race of men who have sprung congenitally from him. Will some one tell us how a test could have been more adequately arranged to meet all the emergencies in the case than the one described in that great third chapter of Genesis? Do not most of our temptations to-

day come to us through eye-gate, ear-gate and palate-gate? Well, there you have the entire category in the first temptation as given in the Bible. Is it not a wonderful narrative? God's Spirit, in giving to the world this story of the first sin, knew better than to try to sever man's psychology from his physiology. More about this latter.

The tree was called by a specific name. According to the Biblical record, God called it "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil." A somewhat cumbersome name, apparently, but the nomenclature is correct—that is, just what it must have been, according to the principles of ethics. Remember it is not called "the tree of good and evil," for then the tree itself would have been good and evil, which would have made God the author of sin. But the tree was called "the tree of the *knowledge* of good and evil," by which was meant that our first parents were *not* to learn good and evil and their difference by taking the evil into their own being in experience; in other words, they were not to *experiment* with evil to see whether it *was* evil. Today there are people who think they must experience evil to know that it is evil; they tamper with it, play with it, and ere they are aware, they are defiled by it, and seriously or fatally injured. No; our first parents were to learn to know the difference between good and evil, not by experimenting with the latter, but by gradual growth in the knowledge of the good under God's guidance. The young man who thinks he must "sow his wild oats" in order to know real life, pays too dearly for his experience, for the harvest will come by and by, and will be one of sorrow and corruption. The same was true of Adam and Eve in the garden—they wanted to take a "short cut" to the knowledge of good and evil. True, they got the knowledge, but by incorporating the evil in their wills and experiences, and thus did themselves and their posterity irreparable harm except as God in grace intervened; whereas God meant that they should gain the knowledge of the difference between good and evil by the normal method of growth in wisdom under His direction and by doing His will.

Some years ago a noted unbeliever declared that this Bible story proved that God wanted to keep Adam and Eve from gaining knowledge—that is, wanted to keep them in ignorance. But that is an unfair way of dealing with the text of Scripture, which does not call the forbidden tree "the tree of knowl-

edge," but "the tree of the knowledge of *good and evil*," meaning the actual touch and contamination of the evil.

Let us now draw nearer to the forbidden tree and see how marvelously the test that came to our first parents was adapted to their composite nature, just as all tests are to human beings today. For the present we will not deal directly with the inveigler, but will try to give the *rationale* of the temptation itself. Look closely at the text (Gen. 3:6). After the tempter had presented his insidious argument, verse 6 says: "And when the woman saw that the tree was *good for food*." Here is a temptation, first, on the physical side of human nature. Of course the *psuche* was engaged, and was the real moral center of man's being, but the allurements came directly and patently through the physical sense, the desire to gratify the appetite. Thus the body had an integral part in the temptation. That is one of the outstanding features of temptation today. When we see the vast amount of corporeal sin in the world today through appetite, lust, lasciviousness, and the awful reality and consequence of such indulgences, we confess we cannot see why scholarly men are so one-sided as to insist that the first temptation must have been purely a subjective psychical allurements. The Biblical doctrine is certainly more inclusive and better balanced than that.

Then the woman saw that the tree was "*a delight to the eyes*." How true that is to the reality of temptation as we know it today! Here was a *locus* in which the *soma* and the *psuche* were about equally engaged, the former the avenue through which the appeal came to the latter. Eyes to see the beauty of the tree, a mind with esthetic powers to appreciate it. Just so men are today often led into evil through physical attractions. For example; more than one man, otherwise noble, has been led to his undoing through the blandishments of womanly beauty. What a wonderfully analytical book is the Bible! Did the writer of this narrative understand modern physiological psychology?

The Biblical text probes still deeper into the very inner nature of ethical temptation: the woman also saw that "the tree was to be *desired to make one wise*." There you have the third fundamental factor in all human testing. While the sense was involved, this last temptation was predominantly on the psychical side—"to make one wise." How many people today sin mostly with their minds, while corporeally they keep themselves

quite clean and upright! They sin by cherishing envy, anger, resentment, sinful ambition, and (worst of all because most inner) spiritual pride and self-righteousness. Then, too, how many people today try to take a "short cut" to knowledge—steal forbidden wisdom—and do evil that good may come!

Thus the first temptation was threefold: first, chiefly physical; second, physico-psychical in about equal ratio; third, mainly psychical. That is the all-inclusive nature of human temptation. We know of no other way by which moral tests come to men. So Christ, the Second Adam, had His three-fold temptation. So St. John speaks of the three kinds of sin: "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life" (1 John 2:16). Where did the Biblical writer take his post-graduate course in psychology and ethics? Will any one inform us how else the pristine temptation could have come to the human family in such a way as to integrate into the whole composite constitution of man?

5. And now we come to another *crux* with the skeptics and the rationalistic critics. By the way, in some respects the infidels and liberal critics are much alike. In the old days of the dominance of Voltaire, Paine, Ingersoll and Underwood the writer perused many an infidel book and tract, and finds that the objections of the old infidels to the Bible are precisely the ones today exploited by the rationalistic critics. Thus rationalism is largely a recrudescence of infidel objections. Just as the infidel arguments of former days were answered by competent apologists, so today the objections of rationalists are being answered by competent conservative scholars. But let us come back to the main issue.

According to the narrative in Gen. III., the inveigler of our first parents was the serpent. If we are willing for the moment to take the teaching of the whole Bible on this point, we shall find that the serpent was only the instrument of Satan. Everywhere in the Scripture where the matter is touched upon the Satanic element in the original temptation is assumed. Christ surely must have meant this when he said that Satan was a liar from the beginning—a liar and the father of lies. If He did not refer to this incident, then there is nothing in history to which, so far as we can see, He could have referred. He did not often speak in enigmas of that kind. The Jews to whom He spoke surely could have put no other interpretation on His words.

Just as concisely as possible let us deal with this subject. First, why was Satan permitted to intrude? Here again the question of free moral agency comes to the fore. Whether we understand it or not, we know that every ethical test must be adequate; it must be strong enough to be an actual test, and yet not so strong as to overpower the will. Perhaps God saw that merely the presence of the one inhibited tree in the midst of this beautiful and abundant Paradise was not an adequate test *per se*. Therefore when Satan made his move to come into the garden, God did not forcibly interfere. Had He done so, He would have prevented an adequate test by physical force. That would have meant the destruction of the ethical in man. Some superficial critics and infidels find fault with God for permitting Satan to intrude. They might as well find fault with the very nature of things as we know them today. Evil is in the world; that is a patent fact; sometime or other God must have permitted it to enter the world. So how does the objection afford any relief in considering the difficulty? Since evil has been allowed to come into the world, the Genetical account is the most rational one yet proposed; and its very *rationale* lies in the inherent nature of moral agency; for as Emerson writes:

"For He who ruleth high and wise,
Nor pauseth in His plan,
Will tear the sun out of the skies
Ere freedom out of man."

Why was Satan permitted to enter Eden in the guise of the serpent? If Satan had appeared in "the guise of an angel of light," he would have overwhelmed the innocent primitive pair's power of resistance; the test would have been overpowering. If Satan had come in his real character and form, his very hideousness would have so appalled our first parents that they would have fled from him in terror. As it was, Satan entered the subtle—that is, cunning and acute, though not evil *per se*—creature called "the serpent," with whose naive and cunning ways the pair were familiar, and thus the test could be effectively applied, and yet it was not overpowering.

There is also profound significance, scientific and philosophical, in the fact that Satan entered a creature of this natural world, and made it his vehicle of blandishment. This accords again with the science of the day, which holds to the unity of the natural and the psychical or spiritual. If the natural cos-

mos and man's psychical nature were made for each other, then the cosmos must have a part in all transactions that concern man. Had Satan been permitted to come in a purely subjective way, nature and man would not have been organically connected at this point, and that would have been fantastic, mythical and mystical, not practical and organic. Such highflown theories are always up in the air, not down here on the ground in the world of reality.

That there must have been a Satanic factor in the original temptation is proved by the fact that there is a Satanic—that is, a personal—element in evil today. Observe the malevolence and persistence of the evil in history and at the present time, and believe, if you can, that it comes only from an abstract principle or a slight disorder in the physical cosmos. The fact is, moral evil can never have its basis merely in the mechanical and impersonal. That would make it only physical evil—but we know from the universal consciousness of mankind that there is moral evil and not merely physical evil, in the world; else no man's conscience would ever condemn him for wrong-doing.

In a subsequent article we shall endeavor to elucidate the historical realism of other details in the remarkable Genetical narrative of the Fall and its consequences. Among other interesting and vital topics, we shall try to throw light on the following points: why the original pair were driven from the Edenic garden; the meaning of the cherubim with the flaming sword set to guard the entrance to the garden; why Adam and Even did not dare to have access to the tree of life after they had sinned; why the beautiful garden disappeared from the earth; the re-appearance of the river and tree of life in St. John's beatific vision of the New Jerusalem, and the restoration of the Paradise that was lost through the Fall, yea, its restoration to more than its pristine beauty and glory through the redemption wrought by Christ our Lord. The Christian hope in Jesus Christ means that, if we are saddened by the pathetic history of Paradise lost, we are inspired and uplifted by the promise of Paradise more than regained. Where sin abounds, grace doth much more abound.

(To be concluded)

The Riddle of Spiritism

By Professor Luther T. Townsend, D.D., LL.D., Brookline, Massachusetts

VIII—Adverse Testimony



ESTIMONY not only against the possibility of establishing the identity of the dead but against the entire subject or scheme of medium spiritism is such as to overshadow with doubt every assertion of medium spiritists that they can communicate with those who have gone from this to the other world.

The following, who are held to be competent authorities, and whose investigations appear to have been fair and thorough, are selected from a still larger number who entertain similar adverse opinions.

In 1884, Henry Seybert, a firm believer in spiritism, furnished a large amount of money for the purpose of investigating the subject. A committee or commission consisting of ten learned men was formed, of which T. R. Hazard, a believer in spiritism, was appointed chairman. The investigation continued for a period of four years and the following was the outcome, with which we are in full agreement if the commission will limit its conclu-

sions to medium spiritism, and this we presume was the intention.

1. Spiritualism is fraudulent.
2. Slate-writing and spirit-photography are performed by legerdemain.
3. Spirit manifestations and materializations are not genuine.
4. Mediums are opposed to critical tests.
5. There is no evidence that mediums are under the influence of departed spirits.

During the winter of 1907-8, Edward Warman, a noted psychologist and hygienist, made the following statements:

After a thorough and unbiased investigation, extending over more than a quarter of a century, an investigation including every phase of Spiritism extant, I have been led, step by step, to the following conclusions, viz.:

1. I believe in the alleged phenomena of Spiritism, but not in the alleged cause.
2. Every true manifestation of Spiritism may be accounted for upon purely scientific grounds.
3. The phenomena are not due to, or ever dependent upon, outside intelligences.
4. There is no valid evidence whatever that spirits of the dead have ever communicated in any manner with the living.

5. Not all spirit mediums are frauds, but all spirit mediums that are not frauds are self-deceived when attributing either their power or their information to spirits of the dead.

6. Clairvoyance and clairaudience are legitimately within the sphere of psychic phenomena, but are wholly independent of disembodied spirits.

7. Premonitions and impressions are God-given gifts to all His children.

Madame Eusapia, a Neapolitan, said to be "the greatest of known mediums," and who had done much by way of convincing such Frenchmen as Flammarion, Lombroso, and Mosselli, and such Englishmen as Wallace, Myers, and Sir Oliver Lodge, of the truth of spiritism, was at length detected and exposed as a fraud and ordered out of England and France.

In 1910 this woman was brought to our country by Mr. Hereward Carrington, himself an advocate of spiritism; he supervised Eusapia's performances here, but after becoming thoroughly familiar with her methods and those of others of the same cult, wrote the results of his investigations in a book entitled, *The Physical Phenomena of Spiritualism*. The conclusion he reached was this, that ninety-eight per cent. of all the manifestations he had witnessed in a lifelong study of the subject are fraudulent, and only about two per cent. genuine, and that he was not sure beyond question, that the two per cent. are communications between the living and the dead.

The personal investigations of the author have not been as thorough as those of the Seybert Commission or as those of Mr. Warman or Mr. Carrington, but they have extended through a longer period, and the conclusion reached is almost the same as that given by these different investigators, especially with that of Mr. Warman, and is this: with some exceptions, of which we shall speak later, the whole gruesome and tantalizing business of medium spiritism has been permeated with fraud; the dancing of chairs and tables, the table rockings, the levitations and flight of various articles of furniture through the air, the suspended human body, the weird knockings and pinchings, the hoarse or squeaking voice of a wild Indian, or that of some other outlander, the fugitive glimpses of spirit faces and hands, the tumbling about on the floor of some entranced medium, the playing upon instruments, notably the tambourine, the automatic writing and speaking, the crystal visions, the slate-writing, much of which has been conditioned upon the dimly lighted room and the curtained cabinet, that are a recurrence of

the caverns of the witches of all past ages, are almost entirely accounted for by sleight-of-hand tricks of the mediums and their helpers, and that nearly all such manifestations have been duplicated and fully exposed over and over again, notably by S. J. Davis, a member of the Society for Psychical Research, Horace Monroe, Kanouse, Sinclair Lewis, David P. Abbott, Joseph F. Rinn, Stanley Hall, and many others.

The question that recurs is this: If these damaging facts and this adverse testimony are established, as they appear to be, then why is it that such multitudes cling to the delusion and become and remain spiritists, even in case of those who are well informed as to the deceptions practised?

Perhaps the best reply to the question has already been hinted at, namely, the conquests of spiritism grow out of the almost unconquerable and instinctive desire of the human mind to go behind the wall or the veil that is hiding us from the invisible world. It is the mysterious and invisible that have for every inquiring mind an insuppressible fascination. The maxim, familiarity begets contempt, had its origin in human experience and plays the mischief with one's fascination. So likewise the knowing of a thing often has a tendency to belittle it. Hence the aim of the professional and advertised medium is to keep up the mystery.

At the same time we ought to say that anyone who cares little or nothing for the invisible spiritual and mysterious world to which we all are hastening, and with which the spiritist claims he is dealing, would seem to be a long way off from normal.

We know very well from the testimony of others and from our own personal experience that the human heart at times is almost frantic to get some word or impression from the spirit world. Many a man at times would give a fortune or a world, if he had it to give, if the veil could be lifted for one moment or if one word could be spoken to let us know, beyond a doubt, where our dear dead ones are, and what they are doing.

But fortunes of money, as yet have not been able to lift the veil much more than an inch. Maurice Maeterlinck speaks our thought when saying, "We catch many suggestions, stray glimpses perhaps, of the great beyond; but the shore remains unknown;" yes, unknown, except as the Lord Jesus Christ has revealed it. And aside from the instinc-

tive longing to know what is beyond there may be a malicious and a mighty deceiver and promoter who is playing a part and who is not recognized. This particular thought, however, for the present is left an open question.

IX—Psychological Phenomena

Before making or suggesting any further admissions we call attention to certain psychological phenomena that have elicited much inquiry, called out no little discussion and are thought to have a bearing upon medium spiritism, though not in all respects helpful to it.

The terms employed to designate these phenomena are: telepathy, odic effluvia, kinetic force, statistism, the ocean of mind, subconsciousness, and the spiritualizing and materializing of the human body.

The term telepathy is usually defined as the transference of thought, in some way as yet unknown, from one person to another, usually by the exercise of the will, though the will is not always employed. As, for instance, when for a time there has been silence in a room or at a table and two persons begin at the same moment to speak on the same subject, employing the same words, there would seem to have been an involuntary thought communication or thought transference.

As would be expected, spiritistic writers tell us that telepathy is a message carried from one person to another by spirits, a supposition that is destitute of scientific support. As a matter of fact this field is as yet only partially explored, still such an amount of material has been secured during the last twenty-five years by the Society for Psychical Research and by independent investigators that it would show poor judgment for one to deny that under certain conditions and in certain cases thought may be transferred from one mind to another without the use of any known method of communication.

It is also now pretty well established that such communications may pass between several persons at the same time, and that distance is not a barrier. There is so much of mystery suggested by the phenomena of telepathy that one may hesitate to dispute even this statement,—that persons may imagine that they see things and hear things that really they do not see or hear, at least with the natural eye; that these imaginary things may be conveyed to other minds; that telepathic fantasma, and telepathic hallucination may bring into view

ghosts, not necessarily those of the dead, but of the living, and that these ghosts, whatever they are, may be transferred from one mind to another are suppositions that appear also to be pretty well established.

This ghost phenomena is rendered all the more plausible by a recent discovery that the human body, under certain conditions, may throw off what is called "odic effluvia" that can shape itself into a human form, and naturally does this, and that under certain conditions this form has been seen by the naked eye and is said to have been photographed, which, of course, could be done if, unaided, the human eye could see it. Now, if all this is really the case, then certain appearances that have contributed to make spiritism plausible may be accounted for without the aid of any spirit imported from the other world.

Another theory that at present is coming in to favor among psychologists is this: that there is an ocean of mind, all-pervasive like the ether or the atmosphere, in which all individual minds may participate without the loss of their personality. If this theory is a psychological fact, it doubtless can explain some phenomena that hitherto have been involved in very great obscurity, and appears at present to stand its ground quite well against successful scientific denial.

X—Physical Phenomena

There is now hardly any doubt among scientists that there is a strange force, named by Professor Flournoy "psycho-dynamis," more frequently called "kinetic force," that has played its part in spiritism. The claim is that without physical contact a person having command of this force can easily lift high objects, and that by contact with them one can lift objects of such weight as greatly to surprise and bewilder scientific investigators.

There is another force, or possibly the same one, though it manifests itself in a different way, which we take the liberty of calling stasisism. It is said to be effectively used by Japanese wrestlers, and just now is in practice by Johnny Coulan, who is on exhibition in the city of Paris. A test case was recently and successfully tried at the Hotel Astor, New York City, January 29, 1921. It was made before a select audience, in which were several medical men of distinction. The test was this: five strong men attempted several times to lift from the floor a frail young woman weighing only 115 pounds, who was barely five feet and two inches in height; these men,

however, failed in each attempt to lift her from the floor. They then tried to force her to the side wall of the room. The account of this effort is thus given by one of the witnesses:

She stood with arms outstretched, hands just touching the wall. The men stood in a row behind her grasping the shoulders of the person in front and all pushed while she resisted, not with her hands, but with the slant of her body. There was intense concentration in every line of her figure. It almost seemed as if she were in a trance. When she relaxed, victorious, she turned faint and shook like an aspen.

To show that she was not glued to the floor she allowed the men to lift her; this easily was done. But they failed to do this the moment she made use of her power of resistance.

This young woman is an American, a Miss Annie Abbott, a native of Atlanta, Georgia. An account given of her early life and experience is the following:

I make no claim that there is anything supernatural about this gift of mine. I discovered it when quite a youngster and have taken no particular pains to develop it. I found that my little brother could not lift me and I defied other children to raise me when we were all playing together in the barn as children will.

Later I was adopted by R. N. Abbey of Atlanta, and when he discovered my gift we decided to make use of it. Since then I have traveled all over the world and appeared before most of the crowned heads of Europe.

Sandow, a professional culturist, challenged Miss Abbott a few years ago while she was in England; they both met at Windsor Castle. The King of England and other people of note were present, and this little, slim, southern maiden, to the amazement of all present, proved more than a match for the strength of that physical giant who had challenged her to the contest.

Dr. Carleton Simon, who was present at the Astor House demonstration, offers the opinion that in her contact with those in opposition, she is able to make an electric circuit, so that the force that is opposed to her simply revolves about those in contact with her; they then become powerless. According to this theory, it is not the strength of Miss Abbott, but the powerlessness of the contestants produced by an electric circuit that enables her to exhibit what seems to be superhuman strength.

Dr. Simon, it will be noticed, presents no scientific proof of his rather ingenious theory. Still it should be allowed a place until a more satisfactory explanation can be offered.

As would be expected, spiritists in this case, as in all others, turn everything that has a bit of mystery about it to their advantage whenever they can do so. Accordingly, it has been suggested that Miss Abbott is a medium but does not know it. Such a claim, we are free to say, has no foundation, and more than that, for one to associate odic effluvia, psychodynamism and stasisism with spiritism is an attempt to mix things that have nothing whatever in common.

There is another explanation of spirit phenomena to which attention is called, advanced by Mr. Frank Podmore, member of the Society for Psychical Research. Following up the defunct theory of evolution as taught by Mr. Darwin, defended by Herbert Spencer and Prof. Haeckel, Mr. Podmore offers the opinion that the manifestations of spiritists may be produced by a rudimentary faculty as yet only partially developed, or by a faculty inherited from a remote ancestry that by disuse has become largely atrophied. This theory, however, seems to have less to commend it than either of the others mentioned, depending as it does, upon a theory that once had almost a world of adherents. But at present there can be found scarcely a first class scientist in Europe or America who will venture to deny this statement, that the hypothesis of evolution is found to be so entirely destitute of scientific evidence in its support that it should be pronounced dead and allowed nothing more than a decent funeral. (See *Collapse of Evolution*, 20c, Frank J. Boyer, Reading, Pa.)

Subconsciousness is another subject that collaterally belongs to our discussion. By this term is meant a state of mind that is not at all times recognized by what is known as the conscious mind. It is spoken of as the abode of "forgotten memories." By some psychologists it is claimed that this subconscious mind never really sleeps; certainly it seems never to forget anything that has once been impressed upon the conscious mind. When, for instance, one has tried in vain for a while to recall a name, but afterwards without any apparent effort the name is remembered, the reasonable supposition is that the name had lingered all the while in the subconscious mind, but for some reason afterwards slipped over into the conscious mind and immediately is recognized as an old friend, or an established tenant of the mind.

As anyone readily can see, it is a fortunate provision that there is this poorly lighted re-

ceptacle in which memories not needed at the time can be retired, otherwise the active or working consciousness would be so overburdened with irrelevant details that it would suffer partial paralysis and be unable to think anything new.

Now, if one has the telepathic gift, one may be able to explore this "sub-cellar" of some other person and discover among "forgotten memories" many things that the owner of "the sub-cellar" or the subconscious mind was not thinking of at the time, or perhaps had not thought of for a long time before. When, therefore, the attention is called to things that had been slumbering in the brain-cells perhaps for many years, it is no wonder that the visitor at the seance is much surprised, and so spiritism gets a credit to which it is in no way entitled.

It also is undoubtedly true that the mental condition of one who has been much given to the ouija and planchette boards, to automatic writing and spiritistic seances, becomes such as to make it comparatively easy for the skilled medium to make explorations into the realms of the subconsciousness, the visitor all the while not suspecting what is going on, and thus spiritism gains a conquest and convert.

The phenomena of spiritualizing and materializing the human body also are of interest. A person in 1909 visiting in the home of Professor Gaines, in Cambridge, Mass., witnessed a test to which Frederick E. Fosket was subjected, and gives the following account of what took place: "Fosket," says the witness, "seemed to dissolve into thin air as we watched him. He was gone forty-one seconds and then materialized. It seems unbelievable, but it certainly seemed so. We hardly know what to think."

Another instance is given where Kellar, the noted magician, in the presence of a large gathering, while under the glare of electric lights, spiritualized and then a few moments later materialized. In introducing himself he made this statement: "Watch me. I am going to spiritualize and then materialize." "He began," says the one who witnessed the performance, "to fade away, became a ghostly apparition, a vanishing mist, and was gone. Shortly a shadow of him and then his form appeared, and finally he sat before us as at the beginning."

It should be said, however, that neither Fosket nor Kellar so much as suggested that the spirits of the dead had anything whatever

to do with what is reported to have taken place.

Anyone who has seen the moving picture entitled "Earthbound," based upon a book by Basil King, will remember the spiritualizing of one man who had been shot and of the one who did the shooting, will need no argument to convince him that by simple mechanical contrivances there can be produced what seem to be ghosts of the living and ghosts of the dead. All such manifestations should therefore be ruled out of the spiritualistic equation.

Now, then, if half or quarter of this we have been saying concerning telepathy, odic effluvia, materializing and spiritualizing, kinetic force, static force, ocean of mind and subconsciousness can be substantiated, and we think all of it can be, then a very large proportion of the phenomena of spiritism, ninety per cent. at least, that has been brought into public notice can be accounted for without calling upon the spirits of the departed either to lend a hand or show a hand. Dr. Phinuit and Mr. Pelham, who communicated with Mrs. Piper, the Indian maid, and Mrs. Leonard, who served as intermediaries for Sir Oliver Lodge; Mr. King's Henry Talbot, Miss Beachamps' "Sally"; Mrs. de Koven's Black Hawk Indian, Dr. Watson's Jewish commercial traveler, named Benjamin, can be dismissed, for through them nothing worth while has been assured concerning the spirit world.

At this point in the discussion some of the author's friends who have examined the manuscript have suggested that he would better go no further; that if he does he will damage the cause he wishes to maintain.

But our feeling is that if we should go no further, then only half of the truth would be told, which would not be a fair treatment of the subject. The author, therefore, in the interest of fair play and the truth, will cross the danger line whatever the cost or risk may be.

XI—Phenomena as Yet Unaccounted For

After having been at sea and under a clouded sky for a time, it is good seamanship at the first favorable opportunity, to take one's bearings. This we now do before making any further advance.

It already has been shown that there is an invisible spirit world in which there are intelligencies, good and bad, and that they have more or less to do with the weal and woe of

humanity; that some of the phenomena of medium spiritism remain the puzzle and almost the despair of careful and well qualified investigators; and, further, that a denial of the facts presented by spiritism is one thing and easy enough, but to explain some of the facts and assign or discover the cause are quite another thing.

We already have pointed out the many things that are damaging to medium spiritism and have offered explanations of some of its marvelous phenomena, but we now confess that there remains a factor that nearly all the most observing investigators acknowledge they are unable to explain. What, therefore, ought to be our attitude towards that which cannot be explained? Shall we deny everything supernatural relating to the subject, or shall we make a concession, not necessarily to medium spiritism, but to a spiritism that teaches that there is a vital, and what may be called an impressioned, contact with the invisible spirit world?

Before giving a direct answer to these questions we offer testimony as to what seems explicable in spiritism.

Harry Kellar, an expert in sleight-of-hand and legerdemain, after attending a seance in Calcutta, India, January 25, 1892, made this confession: "It is needless to say that I went as a skeptic; but I must own that I came away utterly unable to explain by any natural means the phenomena that I witnessed." See *Nineteenth Century Miracles*.

Ballachini, a noted professional conjurer and sleight-of-hand performer, after investigating spiritism made this confession, published in *The Home Circles*:

I have not, in the smallest degree, found anything to be produced by prestidigitative (trickery, juggling or imposture) manifestations or mechanical apparatus; and any explanation of the experiments which took place under the circumstances and conditions then obtaining, by any reference to prestidigitation, is absolutely impossible.

Sir William Crooks, F.R.S., known the world over for his researches in chemical analysis, photography, metallurgy, physical optics and astronomy, writes thus in an article published in *The Quarterly Journal of Science*:

That certain physical phenomena such as the movement of material substances, and the production of sounds resembling electric discharges, occur under circumstances in which they cannot be explained by any physical law at present known, is a fact of which I am as certain as I am of the evidence of my own senses and the testimony of trustworthy witnesses.

Among other incidents given by Dr. Crooks is the following:

I covered, with my finger, a word in a newspaper without seeing it; the planchette wrote a word; when my finger was removed it was found that the word that had been covered was the same that had been written by the planchette.

Now, how was it possible for the planchette to write correctly a word that the doctor himself did not know and that no one else present knew? It was this that convinced the distinguished scientist that the writing of that word was supernormal—a mystery that no branch of science with which he was acquainted could explain.

Hon. G. M. Peebles, in a lecture given at Battle Creek, Michigan, and published in a Chicago paper, relates the following incident:

While in England I dined with John Bright, when transpired quite an earnest conversation on the subject of Spiritualism. He said he had witnessed some of D. D. Home's manifestations and could attribute them to no cause unless it be the one alleged, that of intelligent disembodied spirits.

From the author's point of view, Mr. Bright should have added to the words "intelligent disembodied spirits" the words,—or some other abnormal, supernatural or supernormal cause or agency unknown to science.

A few years ago Lord Rayleigh, one of England's most famous mathematicians, in company with two other men of high standing, made the following test: A medium was swathed, firmly bound, and then connected with a galvanometer, an instrument that quickly and easily detects the slightest movement of the person in connection with it. In a few moments the medium freed herself from the bandages without producing the slightest effect upon the instrument, which from a scientific point of view was an absolute impossibility; yet the thing was done. To these investigators already mentioned, who have confessed their inability to account for what they have witnessed, may be added the names of perhaps a hundred others who have carefully studied the problem of spiritism, and who have confessed that after psychic and mechanical agencies have lent a hand or have spoken their word, and after eliminating all that is fraudulent in spiritism, there appears to remain a something else, a contingent, and that now and then, say one case in a hundred, the mechanical contrivances, the psychical influences and mediums when at their best entirely fail in clearing up the mystery. The fact seems to be that back of all these agencies there is a

mysterious agent who remains in concealment while doing his work and playing his game.

And in dealing with this subject we must reject the reasoning sometimes heard that because many of the phenomena are fraudulent, and that the most of them have been exposed and explained, therefore all are fraudulent and all can be explained; this is defective logic.

The logician would say that the middle term needs to be distributed. Even though ninety-nine cases in the hundred are proved to be fraudulent, the one remaining case may not be fraudulent, though, of course, the ninety-nine fraudulent cases would raise a presumption against the one case that is not fraudulent.

But after what has been said it must be evident that the one genuine case in the hundred should be at least a few times multiplied and an effort made to explain the riddle that has thus far put to silence a multitude of scientific investigators.

XII—A Working Hypothesis— Satanism

At this point every candid person will concede the propriety of introducing what is termed a working hypothesis, which is a supposition under which facts relating to a matter under discussion may be arranged. A working hypothesis is, therefore, a temporary expedient to be held tentatively, but only as long as it is supported by facts, and is to be abandoned whenever the facts discovered give better support to some other supposition.

In order not to arouse antagonism at the outset, the working hypothesis is sometimes not announced until the facts are presented; sometimes, on the other hand, it stands at the head of the discussion. For several reasons the author prefers to state his working hypothesis without further delay, and then present the facts that give it support.

The hypothesis is this: that all the phenomena of modern spiritism that cannot otherwise be accounted for emanate from satanism.

Adopting the method of gradual approach, attention is first called to the fact that nothing is more evident than this: that the historical books of the Old Testament recognize satanism as a real thing. But someone may ask, what if the Bible on this subject is not accredited, then what standing has the hypothesis?

Regarding the Bible for the present as a credited or discredited book, as one may think best, we will, all the same, study its revelations and teachings on the subject of spiritism.

A very remarkable instance of challenge and controversy in the field of occultism was witnessed in Egypt, the land of mystery, when Moses and Aaron on the one side were arrayed against the magicians and sorcerers of Pharaoh on the other. Those men of Egypt did what no modern medium or trickster ever has done, and what no scientific investigator has been able to explain. By their enchantments the magicians turned walking sticks into serpents, and water into blood; they brought an army of frogs upon the land, turned dust into lice and filled the land and houses of the Egyptians with swarms of flies.

But Moses and Aaron in the final tests beat and bewildered the Egyptians, who gave up the contest and acknowledged their defeat. Exodus, chapters 8, 9, 10.

The devout Bible student, of course, believes that Moses and Aaron had divine assistance; but who or what, assisted the Egyptian magicians?

Let that question remain unanswered for the present, while we continue the Bible reading, after defining some of the words employed. The words that are in frequent use are witchcraft, necromancy, unclean demons, unclean spirit, the familiar spirit, the spirit of divination, the soothsayer, the observer of times, the enchanter, the wizard, the witch, the sorcerer; these words mean mediums, that is, those who pretend to have established a connection between the invisible world and ourselves here in this world.

Webster defines "familiar spirit" thus: "It is a demon, or evil spirit, supposed to attend at a call." Gesenius, the eminent Hebrew scholar and lexicographer, defines sorcerers as "those who profess to call up the dead." Dr. Otto John, the well known archaeologist and philologist, speaking of necromancy, says: "Necromancers pretended that they were able by their incantations to summon back departed spirits from their abodes. They uttered the communications which they pretended to receive from the dead." A witch is generally described as "one who is controlled by a familiar or evil spirit."

In the legislation for Israel the point we are making seems to have still stronger support; that is, sorcerers and soothsayers, wizards and witches, were held in utter destestation; they were to be punished, and sometimes the punishment inflicted was the disgraceful death by stoning.

The following are some of the Bible commands:

A man also or woman that hath a familiar spirit (literally, if there be in them a familiar spirit) or one that is a wizard, shall surely be put to death: they shall stone them with stones: their blood shall be upon them. Lev. 20:27.

Regard not them that have familiar spirits, neither seek after wizards to be defiled by them. I am the Lord your God. Lev. 19:31.

And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto the wizards that peep and mutter; should not a people seek unto their God? on behalf of the living should they seek unto the dead? Lev. 20:6.

There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter of familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer for all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord. Deut. 18:10-12.

We may remark in passing that the popular mind at the present time is not prepared to say that spirit mediums, even those who are coining money from bereaved and broken-hearted people by assuring them that they can be put into communication with their dead kindred and friends, ought to be stoned to death, but our personal feeling is that every last one of them ought to be imprisoned, kept at hard labor, and be heavily fined.

Other Old Testament passages are of interest:

Manasseh dealt with evil spirits and wizards: he wrought much wickedness in the sight of the Lord. 2 Kings 21:6.

Moreover the workers with familiar spirits, and the wizards, and the images, and the idols, and all the abominations that were spied in the land of Judah and in Jerusalem, did Josiah put away, that he might perform the works of the law which were written in the book that Hilkiah the priest found in the house of the Lord. 2 Kings 23:24.

The story of King Saul's apostasy and visit to the witch of Endor, already mentioned, and his subsequent misfortunes are among the most pathetic on the subject of witchcraft and made the most instructive of any recorded in the Old Testament. We read:

So Saul died for his transgression which he committed against the Lord, even against the word of the Lord, which he kept not, and also for asking counsel of one that had a familiar spirit, to inquire of it, and inquired not of the Lord: therefore he slew him, and turned the kingdom unto David the son of Jesse. 1 Chron. 10:13, 14.

It was this transgression, downfall and death of Saul that suggested Rudyard Kipling's poem, "On the Road to Endor":

The road to Endor is easy to tread
For mother or yearning wife,

There it is sure, we shall meet our dead
As they were even in life.
Earth has not dreamed of the blessing in store
For desolate hearts on the road to Endor!

Whispers shall comfort us out of the dark—
Hands—ah, God!—that we knew!
Visions and voices—look and hark!—
Shall prove that our tale is true
And that those who passed to the further
shore
May be hailed—at a price—on the road to
Endor.

But they are so deep in their new eclipse
Nothing they say can reach,
Unless it be uttered by alien lips
And framed in a stranger's speech.
The son must send word to the mother that
bore
Through an hireling's mouth. 'Tis the rule of
Endor.

Even so, we have need of faith
And patience to follow the clue.
Often, at first, what the dear one saith
Is babble, or jest, or untrue.
(Lying spirits perplex us sore,
Till our loves—and our lives—are well known
at Endor.)

Oh, the road to Endor is the oldest road
And the craziest road of all!
Straight it runs to the witch's abode,
As it did in the days of Saul,
And nothing has changed of the sorrow in store
For such as go down on the road to Endor!

The record concerning Manasseh is also suggestive. We read: "Manasseh dealt with familiar spirits and wizards" and "caused his children to pass through the fire in the valley of the son of Hinnon: also he observed times and used enchantments, and used witchcraft: he wrought much evil in the sight of the Lord to provoke Him to anger."

In consequence of dealing in this forbidden business of spiritism afflictions followed. Then

he besought the Lord his God, and humbled himself greatly before the God of his fathers, and prayed unto Him, and He was intreated of him, and brought him again to Jerusalem into his kingdom. Then Manasseh knew that the Lord, He was God. 1 Chron. 10:13, 14; 2 Chron. 33:1-16.

Such is some of the legislation and such some of the facts recorded in the Old Testament. "To deny them would be," as John Wesley says, "to give up the Bible."

Passing from the Old to the New Testament, it is found that spiritism was well known, and some of its manifestations were startling. Christ was tempted by one from the spirit world, and likely enough. He was many times during His life on earth tempted by invisible demons as humanity now is and

always has been. Christ resisted these temptations. He cast demons out of people who were demonized. Satan was permitted to lift Christ bodily and place him on the pinnacle of the temple and then on the summit of a mountain; demons were permitted to speak in an audible voice to the Lord Jesus, and he in turn spoke to them. Demons were so numerous that seven of them dwelt in one woman, Mary Magdalene.

The words of Christ are suggestive and prophetic: For there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect. Behold, I have told you before. Matt. 24:24,25.

Luke, the disciple and physician, speaks of one who had a "spirit of an unclean demon," Luke 4:33, and the Pharisees also believed in spiritism. Matt. 9:34.

The Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles, make frequent mention of the doings and sayings of demons. Simon the magician, mentioned in the book of Acts, appears to have been a noted spiritist. Acts 8:9-24.

When Paul and Silas were at Philippi a certain young woman who had been demonized met them and cried out saying, "These men are the servants of the most high God, which show unto us the way of salvation." This woman had spoken the truth. But it was Satan that had used her lips to utter those words. He did this for the purpose of making common cause with Christ. This is one of the strategies of Satan. It is the same thing that is done by mediums when they begin the seance with religious songs; the word "Christian" when applied to the Mrs. Eddy cult is also a serviceable device. Paul understood this and

"being grieved, turned and said to the spirit, I command thee in the name of Jesus Christ come out of her; and he came out the same hour." This woman had been a medium between the people of Philippi and demons and had "brought her masters much gain." Acts, 16:16-19.

Paul wrote the following words to his Corinthian brethren: But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to devils, and not to God: and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils. 1 Cor. 10:20.

To the Thessalonians the apostle gave this prediction and warning. We quote from the *Twentieth Century New Testament*:

For at the coming of the Lord there will be great activity on the part of Satan in the form of

all kinds of deception, miracles, signs and marvels, as well as wicked attempts to delude to the ruin those who are on the path to destruction because they have never received and loved the truth to their own salvation. 2 Thess. 2:9,10.

To his young friend, Timothy, he wrote this: Now the spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron. 1 Tim. 4:1,2.

In the epistle of John is this exhortation: "Believe not every spirit but try the spirits whether they are of God" [he might have added, or of the devil]. 1 John 4:1. In the Book of Revelation Satan figures very largely, and is to continue his career until the end of the present dispensation. These sorcerers, or spirit-mediums are classified with the following persons:

The unbelieving and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers and idolaters and all liars who shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death. Rev. 21:8.

In a word, according to Bible teachings, Satan and demons can afflict and obsess humanity; they are endowed with knowledge, malignity, observation and power, so startling and of such magnitude that the human mind may well be appalled.

A young woman in New York started as a medium but abandoned it. Her testimony was this, "There is something in spiritualism, but it is of the devil. Let it alone."

These spirit demons can do what no human being can do: they can work miracles; they can do everything that is unaccountable in medium spiritism. That is what the Bible teaches, and if what it teaches is authentic and credible then an advance is made towards solving the riddle of spiritism and our hypothesis, so far as the Bible is concerned, is abundantly supported.

NOTE—This is the fourth of a series of articles on "The Riddle of Spiritism," by Dr. Townsend. The first appeared in the January number. The fifth will appear in the May issue.

* * *

Lay taking-part in a church public service is a blessing. One finds his own beliefs and strengthens them as he presents them to others. Impression without expression tends to stagnation. Every crystal lake has an outlet.—*Rev. Eugene B. Smith.*

Epistle to the Philippians

By William H. Bates, D.D., Greeley, Colorado

An Introduction and an Analysis

Philippi



HEN St. Paul, on his second missionary tour, was divinely forbidden to preach the gospel, further, in the interior of Asia Minor (Acts 16:6-8), he came to the seaport town of Troas. There he had a vision in which he saw a man of Macedonia—possibly the tutelary angel-prince of that country [see Dan. 10:13,20]—praying him: "Come over into Macedonia, and help us" (Acts 16:9). Sailing thence, he came to the Macedonian seaport, Neapolis (Acts 16:11), and after a travel of some eight or ten miles, northwest, into the interior, over a paved road, he came to Philippi, the principal city of Macedonia. This was the site of the ancient Grenides—"The Place of Fountains"—remarkable for its geographical position, lying at a mountain pass on a great thoroughfare from the West to the East. Its strategic position led Philip of Macedon (B. C. 359-336) to fortify it, and to give it his own name. Here, some ninety-five years before Paul first saw Philippi, occurred one of the great battles of the world (B. C. 42), which decided the fate of the Roman empire, when Octavianus (afterwards Augustus Cæsar) and Antony defeated the forces of Brutus and Cassius, thus completely wiping out the republican cause. In commemoration of the decisive victory of imperialism over republicanism, Augustus conferred upon Philippi the dignity and privilege of a Roman colony, making it a miniature Rome. Ruins now mark the place.

The Church at Philippi

This church was founded by the Apostle Paul about A. D. 52,—this being the first introduction of the Gospel into Europe, and the beginning of the Christianizing of the West. His companions in labor were Silas, Luke, and Timothy. In the sixteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles is the story of the work there,—the first conversion, that of Lydia (vs. 14, 15); the cure of the demon-possessed damsel, and the trouble that came of it (vs. 16-23); the imprisonment of Paul and Silas, and their miraculous liberation (vs. 24-26); the conversion of the Philippian jailor and his household (vs. 27-34); and the judicial discharge

of Paul and Silas, and their departure from the city (vs. 35-40). Luke and Timothy, apparently, remained behind. Paul seems to have visited Philippi at least twice afterwards (Acts 20:1,2; 20:6).

The Epistle to the Philippians

Some eight or ten years later during Paul's first imprisonment at Rome, the Philippian Christians, learning of his deprivations and distress, raised a contribution (which they had done twice before, Phil. 4:16; 2 Cor. 11:9) for his support, which they sent by the hand of Epaphroditus (Phil. 2:25; 4:18). The occasion of writing the Epistle is the acknowledgment of this benefaction. This is one of the most interesting of all of Paul's letters,—so graceful in its recognitions of favors received; so frank and tender in its appreciations of the excellence of their Christian character, there being not one word of reproof in it; so warm above others in its expressions of affection; so rich in its unfoldings of Christian truth. Above all other of his Epistles, it is the Epistle of joy,—the words "joy" and "rejoice" occurring in it eighteen times, and the word "sin" not once. He sends it by the returning Epaphroditus.

Its contents may be seen in the following

Analysis

I.

I. Introduction. Chap. i. 1-11.

1. Salutation, i. 1, 2.

2. Thanksgiving and prayer, i. 3-11.

II. The State of the Gospel in Rome. Chap. i. 12-26.

1. Its advancement through his imprisonment, i. 12-14.

2. The different kinds of preachers, i. 15-17.

3. His feelings as to the issue, i. 18-24.

4. His hopes concerning the Philippians, i. 25, 26.

III. Exhortations. Chaps. i. 27—ii. 18.

1. To a befitting Christian deportment, i. 27-30.

2. To unity, ii. 1-4.

3. To humility, ii. 5-11, motivated by
(1). The Kenosis, or Christ's self-emptying, ii. 5-8.

- (2.) Christ's exaltation, ii. 9-11.
4. To further following out of the Christian life, ii. 12-16.
 5. To joyful looking for its end, ii. 17, 18.
- IV. Plans for the Philippians. Chap. ii. 19-30.
1. To send Timothy, ii. 19-23.
 2. To visit them again himself, ii. 24.
 3. To send back Epaphroditus, ii. 25-30.
- V. Counsels Against Perils. Chap. iii. 1—iv. -1.
1. From Judaizing teachers, iii. 1, 2.
 2. Contrasts between them and himself, iii. 3-16.
 3. From corrupting examples, iii. 17—iv. 1.
- VI. Final Exhortations. Chaps. iv. 2-9.
1. To harmony, iv. 2, 3.
 2. To joyfulness, iv. 4-7.
 3. To Christian progress, iv. 8, 9.
- VII. Personalia. Chap. iv. 10-23.
1. Thanks for their gift to him, iv. 10-14.

2. Grateful remembrance, iv. 15-19.
3. Doxology, iv. 20.
4. Salutation and benediction, iv. 21-23.

II.

- I. Christ the Believer's Life. Chap. i.
- II. Christ the Believer's Pattern. Chap. ii.
- III. Christ the Believer's Object. Chap. iii.
- IV. Christ the Believer's Strength. Chap. iv.

OR

- I. The Gospel and Christ the Theme. Chap. i.
- II. Humility and Christ the Pattern. Chap. ii.
- III. Earnestness and Christ the Object. Chap. iii.
- IV. Peacefulness and Christ the Strength. Chap. iv.

NOTE—A full Introduction to and Analysis of the Epistle to the Ephesians will be found in BIBLE CHAMPION for January, 1919.

THE CLUB

The Church and the Old Testament

By W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D., Germantown, Pennsylvania



THE letter which appeared in the November BIBLE CHAMPION, criticising Dr. Peake's communication to *The British Weekly* was sent to an English paper, *The Record*. Dr. Peake replied, and to this I have sent the following rejoinder. It is hardly likely that the Editor would be able to find space for Dr. Peake's long letter, but I believe I am doing the latter no injustice when I say that the quotations I have made from Dr. Peake will enable readers to see clearly the lines of his argument.)

Letter to *The Record*

As this is my first available opportunity of writing after receiving your issue of December 28 containing Dr. Peake's letter, I feel sure you will make allowance for my delay in replying. I am glad my former letter has elicited one from Dr. Peake because every statement from the critical side serves to clarify the

issue and to emphasize the fundamental differences between the critical and the conservative positions. Dr. Peake's letter is a fresh proof that these positions are not complementary but contradictory, and that if one is right the other is of necessity wrong. As time goes on, I feel myself in ever-deepening agreement with these words of Professor Jordan of Kingston, Canada:

"It is no use attempting to minimize the difference between the traditional view and the critical treatment of the Old Testament. The difference is immense; they involve different views as to the course of Israel's history, progress of revelation, and the nature of inspiration."—(*American Journal of Theology*, January, 1902, page 114).

Dr. Peake's statements are a strong confirmation of this utterance.

I am afraid that I do not agree that Dr. Peake's letter to *The British Weekly* "was not in defence of the critical position." It went far beyond any "reply to a misrepresentation of a statement made by Rev. John Thom-

as". If it had been only that, it would have called for no notice from me or anyone outside Mr. Thomas himself, but I happen to know that the letter was regarded in this country by able and representative men as an advocacy of the critical position, and it was on this account that I felt led to deal with it.

Dr. Peake, referring to the conservative opposition to criticism, says that "the situation is not to be met from the 'Traditionalists' side with leaflets or pamphlets or discussions in the press, or with the tiny dribble of three-and-sixpenny or six-shilling, or a couple of half guinea books." I cannot think this is a true and fair way of describing works by Dr. W. H. Green of Princeton, Dr. Orr, Dr. M. G. Kyle, Rev. A. H. Finn, and Mr. H. M. Wiener, not to mention several others scarcely less important. Dr. Peake may call these "a phantom army", but I would remind him of the old phrase that "testimonies are to be weighed not numbered."

I cannot think that it is at all adequate to say simply that "literary criticism does not leave historical criticism unaffected". I still maintain, and Dr. Peake's letter alone proves it, that literary criticism very seriously affects historical criticism. If the question were simply one of literary discussion, there would be no real trouble because this would obviously be a matter for scholarship, but it is because on the basis of literary criticism, the question of historical trustworthiness is involved that the literary problem becomes so serious. Proof of this seriousness can be adduced from Dr. Peake's own Commentary. In a book just published over here, *Historical Christianity and the New Theology*, by Dr. H. P. Sloan, an American Methodist clergyman, a recent conversation of Dr. Sloan with Dr. Peake is recorded in these words:

"Some of the positions of this commentary Dr. Peake himself repudiated when the writer discussed them with him in London at the Ecumenical. And in defence of the presence of such radical material in his volume he said, the scholars who had labored with him to produce the commentary were men of such standing that it was necessary to give them considerable latitude with respect to their views."

Readers of the Commentary have only to notice the deplorable lengths to which some of the articles go to see the great seriousness of its statements, involving denials of some of the plainest testimonies of Scripture. To speak of "considerable latitude" is far too mild a way of describing the Commentary when it is remembered that among other things we are

told of "internal inconsistencies", and "a medley of contradictory narratives", and are given flat denials of statements made in New Testament books.

Dr. Peake seems to think that when I quote Sellin, or Gunkel, or Konig, I claim them as on the conservative side. Not at all. I know well that this is not so. All that I contend for is that their disagreement with the Wellhausen position shows that the matter is not so definitely settled as Dr. Peake would have us believe. Indeed, it is a fresh proof of what Sir George Adam Smith said in 1907 in his article in *The Quarterly Review*, that, "while eighteen or twenty years ago, everything was thought to be tolerably well settled, now, apparently, it is mostly all unsettled again" (See Orr, *Bible Under Trial*, p. 311). All these disagreements among scholars should suggest the reconstruction of the entire critical theory. To quote Eerdmans again:

"Personally I am convinced that the critics are on the wrong track, and that we shall never be able to explain the composite character of the Hexateuch if we do not do away with the Jehovistic, Elohist and Priestly works and the numerous younger Jehovistic, Elohist and Priestly writers."

Dr. Kyle, in his *Problem of the Pentateuch*, has shown that it is possible to accept literary dissection without in the least denying Mosaic authorship or date. But Dr. Peake, like Wellhausen, seems to consider everything that emanates from the conservative school as unworthy of attention. The same spirit has led Dr. George Jackson to decline to read Mr. Finn's work, *The Unity of the Pentateuch*, on the ground that the question discussed in that volume has been finally settled for him. Yet scholarship is again and again showing the fatal weakness of the critical position, and no satirical remarks about "a tiny dribble" can prevent thoughtful people from giving attention to the various presentations of the opposition to the critical view. Dr. Peake may not regard it as worthy of his notice, but two recent articles in *The Princeton Theological Review* by Dr. C. M. Mackay of Glasgow once again show the utter impossibility of Wellhausen's view in regard to the central sanctuary and the Priests' Code. "Tiny dribbles" have a curious effect in course of time. "Constant dripping wears away the stone."

With regard to the general critical view, and especially the argument that the Priests' Code comes last in the literary development, I would call special attention to the searching

criticism passed on it by Bishop Knox in his recent fine book, *On What Authority?* He emphasizes two points and gives ample proof in support of his contentions: (1) the uncertainty of Higher Criticism as to its own conclusions; (2) the critical position is not a record of progressive revelation. In regard to the former point, the Bishop, after stating briefly the critical view, says that "such a triumph of pseudonymous literature is surely without parallel in the history of the world", and then he makes the following comment:

"Dr Kennett, in his article on Israel in *Hastings Encyclopedia of Ethics and Religion*, in the first thirty columns, quite honestly but a little naively, 100 times uses such phrases as "perhaps", "possibly", "probably", "not improbably", "may have been", "appears to be", etc. etc. This is not history, and to anchor religion upon so doubtful a record of progressive revelation is surely a hazardous experiment."

In regard to the latter point, Bishop Knox remarks that "it is an axiom of Higher Criticism that the story of Old Testament religion leads up to the Priestly Code", and if this position is right, then the fact of dating the Priestly Code after the Exile "displays not progress but reaction". The entire discussion in the Bishop's book, chapter XI, deserves and demands thorough consideration.

I do not for a moment consider that Dr. Peake is "indifferent to the truth in the Bible". What I do say is that in adopting the critical position and yet holding fast to a belief in the Incarnation, he is standing on impossible ground. It is quite easy to understand the attitude of those who deny the Supernatural, but Dr. Peake is engaged in a futile and, as it will prove, if it has not already proved in many cases, a fatal endeavor to blend incompatible elements. A man who accepts the New Testament revelation of our Lord's Deity cannot logically endorse a view of the Old Testament based on naturalistic premisses. That well-known Australian Methodist, Dr. Fitchett, has just written a book, *Where the Higher Criticism Fails*, in which he points out that the Higher Criticism, in its British form at least, fails because "it talks with two voices. In regard to them it cannot quite make up its mind; it tries to walk in two opposite directions at the same moment of time, a feat which no human pair of legs, theological or other, has yet succeeded in doing." He adds that its symbol is Bunyan's "Mr. Facing-Both-Ways", and in illustration and proof of this contention, Dr. Fitchett deals very frankly and, I

believe, deservedly with the article in Dr. Peake's Commentary by Principal Griffith-Jones.

Dr. Peake complains that I did not refer to Dr. Skinner's *The Divine Names of Genesis*. My reason was that Mr. Wiener's treatment of Dr. Skinner seemed to be an ample discussion, and because, although Wellhausen, the master of modern critical scholars, admitted that Dahse's criticism was a "sore point" in his theory, he nevertheless did not answer Dahse.

As to Robertson's *Early Religion of Israel*, I still hold, Dr. Peake's review notwithstanding, that the great Glasgow scholar has never been properly answered by the critical school, and one proof of this is the manifest modification of the view of monotheism which conservative scholarship has compelled criticism to admit during recent years. Professor Robertson's book ought to have had far more and fuller attention than is involved in one review. But it has had its effect in showing the untenableness of the critical view about Hebrew monotheism.

When I referred to Sellin, Dr. Burney and others as approximating to the Traditional views, it was, as I have already mentioned above, in proof of the fact that the questions have not been settled, and as to the vital significance of this approximation, I would again refer to the words of the late Dr. Hastings:

"If the Decalogue can be shown to come from Moses, or from the age of Moses, the present critical position on the early religion of Israel will have to be abandoned."

Could anything be more impressive than this as to the fundamental change involved in the claim of Sellin and Dr. Burney that the Decalogue comes from the time of Moses? So also in regard to Dr. Welch, I fully recognize his position towards criticism, and yet I contend that when a man of his stamp can write about Wellhausen as he does, it shows that the matters thought to be closed years ago are as open as ever.

Dr. Peake still talks of the "four main documents", but he knows that Criticism has now gone far beyond this, as Eerdmans pointed out several years ago. Indeed, if Dr. Peake still holds to this position, he himself has already been left far behind in the critical progress. As to his view of "the late date of the Deuteronomic Code, its identification with the law book of Josiah's reformation", he has to face Dr. Kennett's contention that Deuteronomy dates from the Exile, while the argument

that the Priestly Code is posterior to Ezekiel has been shown to be utterly impossible by Baxter in his *Sanctuary and Sacrifice*, as well as in a briefer form by Bishop Knox and Dr. Mackay as mentioned above.

Dr. Peake refers again to the very slender output of conservative scholars and remarks that "till quite recently it has been a disadvantage to a man, especially in some Churches, to be known to hold critical views." It would be interesting to know what is meant by "quite recently", because, while Dr. Peake refers to "Churches," it is certainly untrue to say this of colleges and universities, where not merely "till quite recently" but for a long time past, the critical view has been taught to students as the only true and scholarly position. It is not quite fair or worthy of Dr. Peake to indulge in satire when he says that he presumes "Churches and college councils do not appoint professors who have their subjects still to get up." He knows, or ought to know, that such a statement is not true of many who take the conservative side. Their position has long been as fixed as his own. And it is a mere begging of the question to say that the drift of scholars almost entirely in one direction is due to the drift of the evidence. Like others of the critical school, Dr. Peake is unable to recognize any evidence in the conservative direction, but we who take the latter position maintain that the "drift of the evidence" is entirely opposed to the critical view.

I am afraid I must still insist that critical scholarship ignores the arguments of Traditionalists. It is natural for Dr. Peake to champion his master Wellhausen, but it is really impossible for him, with all his advocacy, to get over two plain facts. First, Dr. Witton Davies' language was perfectly unambiguous in regard to the way in which Wellhausen ignored all criticisms of his own position on the Old Testament. And second, even though he was "largely occupied with his New Testament work," the results of that work in the Unitarian conception of Christ and the unscholarly avoidance, not to say evasion, of the question of the Virgin Birth, might well have given pause to Dr. Peake, as it has done to many believers in the Incarnation, as they have noted the conclusions drawn by Wellhausen on the Old Testament. But, unlike many of his followers, the German scholar was logical and courageous enough to carry through his principles to their inevitable conclusion. Years ago, this was

recognized and pointed out by Dr. D. W. Simon in *Some Bible Problems* (p. 284):

"It will prove also logically impossible, on the premises from which the chief critical leaders start, to avoid being landed in the conclusions about Christ which Wellhausen has reached."

Sir William Robertson Nicoll, in commenting in 1903 on a speech delivered by Mr. (now Lord) Balfour in connection with the Bible Society Centenary, made the following significant remarks:

"More than twenty years ago the present writer, walking with Julius Wellhausen in the quaint streets of Griefswald, ventured to ask him whether if his views were accepted, the Bible could retain its place in the estimation of the common people. 'I cannot see how that is possible,' was the sad reply."

As to Daniel, I am willing to leave out entirely Dr. Dick Wilson's book and his article in the Princeton volume, although I do not consider Dr. Peake's answer satisfactory. But it is surprising that neither Dr. Peake nor Dr. Andrews should have noticed some words by that great authority, Professor Pinches, spoken at a meeting of the Victoria Institute in February, 1917: "I am glad to think with regard to the book of Daniel that the Higher Criticism is in fact buried" (Journal, vol. 49, p. 135). Surely Peake's Commentary ought to have taken account of a paper by so eminent an archaeological scholar. The question has often been asked and was recently asked over here once again by an able Lutheran professor, Dr. Keyser: "Do not the radicals know what the conservatives are writing? If they know, do they not care? If they do not know, it is a reflection on their scholarship. If they do not care, it is a question of ethics."

I have read again my former letter in the light of Dr. Peake's reply, and find that he has left some of the most vital points at issue between the critical and conservative positions altogether without notice. My main contention was expressed in the words of the well-known journalist who said:

"The real truth is that the adoption of the Wellhausen view is fatal to the supernaturalism of the Old Testament. In the hands of both Wellhausen and Kuenen, the religion of Israel was deprived of supernaturalism by the simple plan of rearranging the books of the Old Testament so as to bring the religion into harmony with the principle of evolution."

I also quoted from a critical scholar who wrote some time ago to a friend of mine in these terms:

"I was never quite satisfied with the Wellhausen hypothesis (not even when I was editing—for Haupt's Rainbow Bible), and since that time my faith has been further shaken by additional researches in the wider field of Pentateuchal Criticism."

Not least of all, I called attention to a remarkable article by Mr. Weir of Glasgow University, who maintains that the whole of recent Old Testament Criticism "is founded on an entire misconception as to what the aims of the methods of the Semitic writers were", and he adds:

"If there were nothing else to condemn the modern criticism of the old Hebrew literature, it would be enough that no one who has been brought up, or who has lived long, in the East is a critic."

These utterances do not form part of that "tiny dribble" of conservative scholarship to which Dr. Peake refers.

In conclusion, I will just remark that what

we conservatives desire and what we believe we have a right to demand is, as a recent writer in *The Methodist Recorder* said, that we should be told clearly and fully what are the "assured results" of Higher Criticism in connection with such parts of the Bible as the Creation, the Fall, Prophecy, Miracles, and the spiritual experience of the saints of the Old and New Testaments. Then, too, we ought to be told what are the fundamental principles and distinct methods by which these "assured results" have been reached. When we thus know the results and the way they have been obtained, we shall be able to give them proper consideration, but apart from this information it is impossible to accept without question either results or methods so long as we believe in the historical trustworthiness and spiritual reality of the Bible as the Word of God.

The Continent Attacks the Book of Daniel— Dr. Robert Dick Wilson Answers

[Reprinted after several urgent requests from *The Sunday School Times*]



PRESBYTERIAN weekly. *The Continent*, wellknown for its persistent advocacy of that position in Bible study which denies the full inspiration and inerrancy of the Bible, and a journal which denounced the Bible Union of China as a regrettable and mischievous thing, published in its issue of July 20 an editorial condemning as unwholesome *The Sunday School Times'* teachings of the past summer on the book of Daniel, and accusing Professor Robert Dick Wilson, of Princeton, as being evasive. *The Continent* frankly questions the historicity of the book of Daniel, asserting that there is serious difficulty in believing this. The entire editorial is as follows:

WHY NEEDLESSLY HAMPER FAITH

Inability to represent accurately the inference of critical Bible study seems to be an inevitable fault with most of those whose convictions oblige them to oppose such study. Blunders of that sort persuade many persons that being liberal in Bible interpretations necessarily requires a man to be infidelic. Infidels are thus created automatically, as it were, where just appraisement of the theories which conservatives reject would show that, even though erroneous, there usually is nothing in them incompatible with simple personal faith in the way of salvation which the Holy Scriptures were given to reveal to humanity.

The present season's progress of the International Sunday School Lessons through the book of Daniel has brought out some unhappy exhibits of this disposition. The historicity of the book has naturally come up for discussion. Now even if Daniel is the most literal record of precise fact which exists in all literature, belief in the precision of that record is no necessary part of a full and obedient trust in the authority of God's revelation of himself through the Holy Bible. Yet the opposite implication is strong in much Sunday-school literature now current. *The Sunday School Times*, for instance, says modern criticism teaches that the book of Daniel is a "literary fake compiled by benevolent impostors." The inference intended and conveyed is that any one not accepting Daniel as a history must regard the Bible as a volume disfigured with "fakes" and therefore unworthy of the God of truth. That amounts to a direct invitation for a young student to repudiate the Bible if he cannot regard every line of Daniel as a recital of literal events.

Hardly anything could be less fair or less wholesome to present to young minds as a defense of the Scriptures. If Daniel is not a history, it is by no means a "fake" but simply a historical novel, written in all good faith by some sincere man, eager in this way to teach the people of his time to trust in God and be true to him, no matter what perils threatened or persecutions actually befell. And if the work was prepared and put forth to Israel in such circumstances, nobody contemporary was deceived as to its character—any more than the generation prior to the Civil War in this country presumed that "Uncle Tom's Cabin" was a

chronicle of actual living persons. Nor is there the least reason to maintain that Daniel, if merely a novel based on history must on that account be rated an uninspired book. Who dares tell the Spirit of God that he may inspire nothing except literally exact history? Or who would be competent to say that the book of Daniel as a mighty exploit of imagination in the realm of faith—which it certainly is if it is not historical—was unworthy of Biblical preservation to serve the faith of later generations?

The serious difficulty about believing Daniel historical lies neither in its miracles nor in its prophecy but in its pictures of Babylonian history. The book represents Darius as the first Median ruler in Babylon. Darius was a historical character, but he does not, in the place where the writer of Daniel puts him, fit in at all with what the surviving monuments of Babylon record. The attempts of even so great a conservative scholar as Dr. Robert Dick Wilson to explain away the discrepancy can in justice be called nothing better than evasion. It is surely the worst of spiritual policy to stake the spiritual quality of the Scriptures on a point so hazardous as this historical claim for Daniel.

Dr. Wilson's Comment on *The Continent* Editorial

The Editor of *The Sunday School Times* has asked Professor Wilson for his views on *The Continent's* editorial.

Those who read Mr. Howard's sketch of Professor Wilson's remarkable studies (which was published in *The Sunday School Times* of May 13, 1922), will remember one of Professor Wilson's remarks: "I have come now to the conviction that *no man knows enough to assail the truthfulness of the Old Testament*. Whenever there is sufficient documentary evidence to make an investigation, the statements of the Bible, in the original texts, have stood the test." And it is to be borne in mind that Dr. Wilson's first-hand knowledge of the languages and dialects collateral or contemporary with Bible writings, including what "the surviving monuments of Babylon record," is such that the knowledge of most of the so-called critical Bible "scholars" is simple ignorance in comparison.

Unable to learn Babylonian in America, Dr. Wilson as a young man went to Heidelberg "determined to learn every language that would enable him to better understand the Scriptures, and to make his investigations in original documents. So to Babylonian he added Ethiopic, Phoenician, all the Aramic dialects, and Egyptian, Coptic, Persian, and Armenian. He studied in Berlin with Schrader, who was Delitzsch's teacher, called the father of Assyriology. He studied his Arabic and Syriac under Sachau, and Arabic un-

der Jahn and Dieterichi; Hebrew under Dillmann and Strack, and Egyptian under Brugsch. He became conversant with some twenty-six languages in these years devoted to language acquisition."

It is to be doubted whether the editor of *The Continent*, or the unnamed "authority" from whom he draws the "facts" in his editorial, really has Dr. Robert Dick Wilson's knowledge of the historical value of the book of Daniel.

Dr. Wilson's comments on the *Continent* editorial:

1. It will be observed that the editor of *The Continent* has discarded the theory of inspiration as it has always been held by the church. For him, neither the words nor the thoughts are inspired; but only the main purpose of the book, "to teach the people of his [the author's] time to trust in God and be true to him, no matter what perils threatened or persecutions actually befell." In attempting to fulfill this purpose, the inspired author, according to this view, may have made mistakes.

2. The "young student" is to be saved from his doubts and difficulties by being informed that "the book of Daniel is a mighty exploit of imagination in the realm of the faith." One can accept and believe what he likes of the lines and parts of it; the only thing of importance is the main idea. Unfortunately, this view is impossible to reconcile with the treatment accorded to the book by Christ and the writer to the Hebrews. So, the poor young student escapes from the frying pan of difficulties concerning the Book of Daniel only to jump into the fires of the New Testament interpretations.

3. In the third place, the editor of *The Continent* states, as it were in passing, his opinion that the serious difficulty about believing Daniel lies in its pictures of Babylonian history. "The book," says he, "represents Darius as the first Median ruler in Babylon. Darius was a historical character, but he does not, in the place where the writer of Daniel puts him, fit in at all with what the surviving monuments of Babylon record."

What characteristic statements of the radical critic are these! Of course, by Darius "the historical character" he cannot mean the Darius the Mede of Daniel, but Darius the son of Hystaspis the Persian. What, then, becomes of his great historical novelist with his ability in the second century B. C. to write a work that was accepted as true by the Jewish scholars of that time? Imagine, if you can, a Jew-

ish writer of the second century B. C., with the books of Chronicles, Ezra, Herodotus, Ctesias, and many others before him and known to his readers, making Darius Hystaspis king of Babylon and of the Chaldeans right after Belshazzar! Think of his making the well-known Darius the son of Hystaspis, who delights in calling himself a Persian of the line of the Achaemendiadae, into a Mede the son of Ashasuerus! Why did Darius Hystaspis so frequently call himself the Persian if there had not been another Darius before him who was not a Persian?

4. This critic asserts that a Darius after Belshazzar "does not fit in with what the surviving monuments of Babylon record." *What surviving monuments?* Does the editor of *The Continent* not know that there is no inscription from Babylon of any Persian king except the proclamation of Cyrus, which was issued immediately after his conquest of Babylon? Beside this, there is no other historical inscription of any Persian king known to us except the Behistun inscription of Darius Hystaspis from about 515 B. C., but this says nothing about the reign of Cyrus in Babylon. It is futile to appeal to the contract tablets, for all the information that they give, bearing upon the question, are the mention of Gubaru once and the dates of the kings of the Persian empire and of a few rebels against them.

But the book of Daniel merely states that Darius the Mede was king of the Chaldeans of Babylon. If we allow that Darius the Mede was a sub-king under Cyrus all the difficulties with regard to him will be surmounted. The Persian monarchs, like their Assyrian and Babylonian predecessors, were kings of kings. Cyrus appointed the de-throned Astyages king of Media, Croesus king of Lydia, and Nabonidus king of Babylon, to be rulers of cities and provinces under him; why not also Darius the Mede to be king of the Chaldeans and Babylon? (If any one desires to investigate the whole subject of Darius the Mede, he is referred to my "Studies in the Book of Daniel," pages 83-96, 128-175, and to my article in the *Princeton Theological Review* for April, 1922.)

In view of the fact that the monuments of Babylon represent Gubaru, or Ugbaru, as the name of the man whom Cyrus appointed *pihatu*, or governor, of Babylon, we may suppose that Darius was Gubaru's regnal, or second name. Nearly all the great kings of Persia had two names, and it was the habit of the Assyrians and Babylonians to give new

names to their subject kings and even to the foreign princes at the royal court. Or, we may suppose that Darius the Mede the son of Xerxes (or Cyaxares) was "made king" of the Chaldean empire of Belshazzar, and was in consequence an overlord of Gubaru, *pihatu* of Babylon.

It is no objection to this supposition to say that no documents are dated with the names of Gubaru, or Darius the Mede; for none of the documents of either the Babylonian or Persian kings are dated with the names of any of the subject kings or governors, but only with the name of the kings of kings. The only apparent exception to this otherwise uniform custom is in the case of Cambyses, son of Cyrus, who, probably on account of the absence of his father on distant expeditions, exercised for a time as vice-roy the prerogatives of the king of kings.

Thus we see that, without any "evasion," but simply by making legitimate use of the data at our command, the account of Darius the Mede as given by Daniel may readily fit in with the surviving monuments of Babylon.

In fine, while there is not sufficient evidence to show that Darius the Mede was ever king of the Medes (*and Daniel never calls him king of the Medes*), there is sufficient evidence to enable us to believe that he was king of the Chaldeans and Babylon after the death of Belshazzar, as *Daniel represents him to have been*.

And readers must not forget that the book of Daniel itself is documentary evidence, and that this documentary evidence cannot be gainsaid by the mere suppositions of modern scholars. A modern scholar, however eminent, cannot manufacture evidence. He must abide by the evidence of ancient documents contemporary, as far as possible, with the events described. You, my reader, knew nothing, I know nothing, the critic knows nothing, nobody knows anything, about what happened two thousand to twenty-five thousand years ago, except in so far as we have documentary evidence. The opinions of an editor, or of a professor, are worthless as evidence against the historicity of Daniel unless they are logical conclusions from thoroughly established facts in evidence. How does the editor of *The Continent* know that what Daniel says about Darius the Mede "does not fit in with what the surviving monuments of Babylon record"? He does not know. He cannot know. He ought to know that the most brilliant imagination cannot project its thoughts upon the canvas of the sixth century B. C. and call them evidence.—*S. S. Times*.

Wesley, Toplady and Sanctification

By Professor John Alfred Falkner, D.D., Madison, New Jersey



HETHER a periodical devoted to the defense of the evangelical faith should attack persons or doctrines represented by churches also holding that faith must be left to the editors.

My own feeling might be expressed thus: Fight rationalism, fight Higher Criticism, so far as it is erroneous and pernicious, fight false (not true) liberalism in doctrine, but don't fight each other; let not the Arminian fight Calvinist nor Calvinist the Arminian, let not the one attack Calvin nor the other Wesley; but let all unite in love and hearty appreciation of each other's good points, and fight the common foe. As an esteemed contributor, however, has repeatedly attacked Wesley's doctrine of sin and Christian Perfection, and in the last number in the article on Toplady's, Wesley's moral character besides I might be allowed a word.

Toplady first meets us in Wesley's life in 1758 when he was eighteen and Wesley was fifty-five. He had been converted a couple of years before under one of Wesley's preachers, and was now a student in Trinity College, Dublin, whence he writes a nice letter to Wesley, given in Tyerman, *Wesley*, ii. 315-6. There were two schools of Methodists, Calvinist and Arminian. In 1768 six students were expelled from St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford, "for holding" (as a contemporary magazine says) "Methodistical tenets, and taking upon them to pray, read or expound the Scriptures, and sing hymns in private houses." They belonged to the Calvinist party, and though in the published charges this fact was not emphasized (the only echo being that they hold "once a child of God always a child of God") in the later pamphleteering on their expulsion the right of Calvinism in the Church was discussed. Nowell defended the expulsion and also attacked Calvinism as being no part of Anglican teaching in the interest of vindicating the authorities for getting rid of the six Calvinists. In 1769 Toplady published two big pamphlets for the six students, one of the two being *The Doctrine of Absolute Predestination Stated, Translated in great Measure from the Latin of Zanchius*. Tyerman, who—though a Methodist—is a thoroughly frank critic of Wesley, went into these pamphlets of Toplady, and says that their teachings are as near an approach to the heathen doctrine of fate as it is possible to conceive, that

a more impious piece in the garb of piety than his Zanchius was never published, that the other pamphlet was rank with the most violent abuse of Nowell and the other Arminian clergy, the upshot being that all holding different opinions from the writer are reprobate knaves and fools (iii, 54-5). The organ of the Calvinist party in the Church, *The Gospel Magazine*, in the same year (1769) published an attack on Wesley, *Observations on Mr. J. Wesley's View of the Scriptural Doctrines of Predestination, Election and Reprobation*, in which he accuses him of inexcusable vanity, impertinent quibbling, jesuitical sophistry, absurd and impious opinions, etc. Remember Wesley had published not a line against young Toplady, though in private letters of 1769 and early 1770 Toplady's vanity had so affected him that he says, Surely wisdom will die with him, and calls him a coxcomb and vain boaster, which—without the slightest reflection on his character—he was.

In the next year (1770), however, Wesley did come into the controversy with Toplady to this extent that he used a literary device well known at the time and considered perfectly proper, that is, he published an abridgment of Toplady's pamphlet with this title, *The Doctrine of Absolute Predestination Stated and Asserted. By the Rev. Mr. A——T——*. Everybody knew that the pamphlet in this form was not literally by Toplady. By abridgment, by leaving out all verbiage, circumlocutions, defenses, Toplady's Calvinism was left in its nakedness to the judgment of reason and religion, though without a word of Wesley's added, except preface and postscript which everybody knew were the product of Wesley's controversial playfulness or keenness. The preface read: "It is granted that the ensuing tract is in good measure a translation. Nevertheless, considering the unparalleled modesty and self-diffidence of the young translator, it may well pass for an original." The postscript read: "The sum of all is this: One in twenty (suppose) of mankind are elected; nineteen in twenty are reprobated. The elect shall be saved, do what they will; the reprobate shall be damned, do what they can. Reader, believe this, or be damned. Witness my hand.

A——T——"

There was not a reader of this pamphlet of Wesley but that knew it was a simple *jeu*

l'esprit of the writer, a stroke of wit by which he summed up the logical drive of Toplady's big pamphlet, attaching his initials as a rhetorical device. It was not only no "lie", as your contributor calls it, it was simply a controversial method of showing the real animus of Toplady's book, which every fair-minded reader of the time would appreciate immediately.

Instead of laughing at Wesley's *reductio ad absurdum* of his Zanchius work and ignoring it, Toplady came out with so fierce a pamphlet against Wesley that Tyerman thinks a charitable judgment is that in an angry paroxysm of mortified vanity he was for the time being almost insane, his charges are so outrageous (iii. 82). Though Wesley had said not a word against Toplady's character, in this new pamphlet the young man calls Wesley a jesuit, a pope, a lurking sly assassin, speaks of his low serpentine cunning, and exhorts him to dismiss those dirty subterfuges of his malicious impotence which degrade the man of parts into a lying sophister, and sink a divine into the level of an oyster woman (his actual words). "I would no more enter into a formal controversy with such a scribbler than I would contend for the wall with a chimney sweeper." Now, remember again, in spite of Toplady's published denunciations of him personally, Wesley never—before, now, or later—uttered a word of public attack on Toplady. Wesley's friend Merryweather of Yarm wrote to him calling his attention to this scurrilious book of Toplady, and apparently urging him to reply. But he had more important work at hand. He could not come down. He wrote to Merryweather.

"York, June 24, 1770.

"My dear Brother,

"Mr. Augustus Toplady I know well; but I do not fight with chimney sweepers. He is too dirty a writer for me to meddle with; I should only foul my fingers. I read his title page, and troubled myself no farther. I leave him to Mr. Sellon. He cannot be in better hands.

"As long as you are seeking and expecting to love God with all your heart, so long your soul will live.

"I am your affectionate brother,

"John Wesley."

Even in this private letter, not published till Tyerman (iii. 83) in 1872, Wesley says not a word against his opponent's character, referring, as Merryweather knew, only to his

controversial epithets, his literary denunciations.

I need not carry this story farther. Toplady without provocation wrote another book against Wesley in 1772, equally complimentary. Again Wesley did not reply. He followed it with a third in 1774 in two vols., in the introduction to which he lays the cudgels once more on the back of the aged Wesley, who is still too busy to answer and receives the scourge with silence. Finally in 1775 Toplady came out with a final onslaught, not to speak of whatever he may have published derogatory to Wesley in his *Gospel Magazine* while editor. (December 1775—June 1776).

But Wesley's forbearance must be rightly judged. He simply could not answer such opponents. He was physically incompetent for lack of time and strength, for Toplady was only one of scores if not hundreds; he was morally incompetent because he could not descend to their methods. Even ancient Romans and Greeks never bombarded early Christianity with such incessant defamations. "Wesley had too much self respect to notice vulgarities like these; and yet they were far from being pleasant, and tend to show that Methodism struggled into its mighty manhood amid incessant peltings of every kind of pitiless persecution. The storm during Wesley's life time from one quarter or another was perpetual; but powerless to destroy, it simply made the roots of the tree strike deeper" (Tyerman iii. 210).

From this history I draw a different conclusion from that of your eminent contributor. Did Toplady storm Wesley with scurrilities? Did Wesley speak in a private letter too frankly of Toplady's vanity, and from our point of view make once an unwarranted use of his pamphlet? Neither the one nor the other reflect in the slightest on their character or their sanctity. For all that, they may have been entirely sanctified and perfect in love (so far as anyone can be in this life). Those were simply controversial ways of the age, the ethical standards of the time for which these two men were not responsible. It is the long evolution of time to divorce the thought of moral obliquity from holders of doctrinal error, and the imputing of that obliquity to your opponent may be only the reflex of your earnest love of truth. When the saint calls his theological acquaintance a knave and a fool, as hundreds called Wesley, he needs to cure him not more sanctity, not more baptism of the Spirit, but a larger education, the touch of a higher civilization, of

a sweeter tolerance, a study of psychology, of the law of environment, etc., etc. The antagonists in the fierce controversies of that eighteenth century were lacking in tolerance and largeness of outlook then impossible, not in love of truth or of men and not in sanctity.

Your able contributor uses the Toplady-Wesley incident as an argument against the Methodist doctrine of sanctification (of course, without mentioning it by name), enters into a further Scriptural refutation of it, and calls attention to his two former articles in your columns on the same subject. As to the first point, I have already said it has no bearing whatever. They did not "scrap", much less "like children of the devil" (Wesley did not "scrap" at all), they had no "scandalous scrimmage". They had—especially the young man—a religious controversy, and if the young fellow thought Wesley's doctrines were false and pernicious, as he did, he had a perfect right to say so, and if he thought Wesley "lied" and had committed other sins, as he did think, he had a perfect right to say that also. If he went to an extreme in denunciation, as he did, put that down to his temperament (perhaps momentarily unbalanced), his hot jealousy for the truth, and to the ethical standards of the time in matters of controversy. The incident did not affect their saintship one iota.

Nor does Rom. 7 teach the Calvinistic doctrine of the "carnal mind", etc. Verses 1-6: we have been discharged by Christ from the law as a law of bondage and of the letter. Verses 7-13: by the commandments we became (verbs in past tense) conscious of the

sinfulness of sin and died to our self conceit. Verses 14-25: by a dramatic transition not rare with Paul he visualizes as a present thing his past experience as an awakened sinner, as knowing the good but not doing it, not doing it because of the lower nature ("the law of the members", "flesh", which almost always means with Paul not the body in itself considered but the whole nature as under sin, "body of this death"). But he is awakened and desires better things. In the eighth chapter he has gone out of this twilight zone, he has conquered, he no longer even with the "flesh" serves the law of sin, he is "in Christ", free from the law of sin and death, and he walks not after the flesh but after the Spirit, for the Spirit dwells in him. That is, he is a sanctified Christian like Wesley and Toplady, perfect in love (in the New Testament meaning of the word perfect), but with vast room for improvement in everlasting growth toward the absolutely perfect image of God. The expression "I am carnal, sold under sin" in 7.14 does not mean at all that the Christian must sin and then refrain, fall and then rise, be contemptible and then noble, miserable and then happy, but is a figurative expression of the old life under the awakening influence of the Spirit, on the way to the new life of the glorious chapter eight.

I apologize to the editor for defending, though too briefly the teachings of my church in a periodical intended for all communions, but as they have been repeatedly attacked (of course not as such or by name) it seemed only fair that a word should be said. I trust there will be no further occasion.

Were the Pastoral Epistles written by St. Paul?

By The Rev. Prof. A. H. Sayce, LL.D., Queens College, Oxford



MUST begin with an apology. I am not a New Testament critic; what Biblical work I have done has been mainly confined to the Old Testament; and it is therefore reasonable to ask why I should venture upon the New Testament domain. But both Old and New Testament students are confronted by much the same questions and problems, and a sane and sound critical method must be alike in both cases. And one who does not profess to be a New Testament "specialist," but whose literary life has been largely occupied with the interpretation and appraisal of ancient Semitic texts has the advantage of approaching the New Testament text with an unprejudiced

mind, undisturbed by the conflicting theories of its critics. "Lookers on see most the game," at all events when they have already had experience of it themselves, and where questions of authorship and the like are involved the outsider's point of view is likely not only to possess the freshness of common sense but also freedom from the shifting influence of unimportant details.

The main argument of the opponents of the Pauline authorship of the three Pastoral Epistles has been the difference in style between them and the other Epistles of the Apostle. Considering the number of modern writers whose style has varied not only at different periods in their lives but even at the same

period to such an extent that had they lived in the Greco-Roman age scholars would have refused to believe their works could have been the products of the same pens, the argument is exceedingly precarious. And reading the Pastoral Epistles with the eyes of the outsider, I am constrained to deny that the argument has a foundation in fact. There is a difference in style, certainly; but it is superficial, and largely dependent on the changed conditions in the inner life of Christianity to which the Epistles bear witness. On the other hand, I am struck by what is an essential feature in the undisputed Epistles of the Apostle, and what I do not think would have been reproduced in the work of an imitator. This is the want of logical sequence in S. Paul's thought; he goes off, as it were, at a tangent from a single word which leads him suddenly and inconsequentially into a new train of ideas. This is the really important characteristic of S. Paul's "style," and it is as much a feature of the Pastoral Epistles as of those to the Romans or Galatians.

Superficially there are differences, and if the Epistles are genuine these differences must be expected. (1) The Epistles belong to a later period in the Apostle's life than those which were included in Marcion's collection. Between the two groups came the Apostle's acquittal and restoration to liberty, his journey to Spain referred to by his contemporary and companion in Rome, S. Clemens Romanus, and above all the changed conditions in the Christian Church itself. It had become definitely separated and distinguished from Judaism and was filled with teachers and writers who were endeavoring to reconcile its teaching with the philosophies and cosmological systems of paganism. A new vocabulary, with the new modes of expression resulting from this, was needed and had come into use.

(2) Then S. Paul's amanuensis would naturally not have been the same as those of his earlier Epistles. Like other writers of his time, we know that he employed a secretary and only for special purposes appended his own name to what had been written (see 2 Thess. III. 17, Phil. 19). While the thought was S. Paul's own, the mode of expressing it in Greek would have varied even more than is the case with the notes written by the private secretaries of cabinet ministers in our own days.

(3) And lastly, S. Paul had grown old; and accordingly, if we may judge from modern experience, the form in which his thought ex-

pressed itself would have been likely to undergo a certain amount of change. The freshness of youth was departed, along with its illusions; neither S. Paul nor his converts looked forward any longer to an immediate return of Christ and the resurrection of the dead; while the Church had become an organized body with permanent institutions and a fixed place in society. The mustard-seed had been planted and was already beginning to grow into a tree.

Even more striking than the references to false teachers and forms of Christianity in which Christ became a mere philosophic abstraction or a reflection of the Babylonian god Bel are the references in the Pastoral Epistles to liturgical forms which had already become established in the service of the Church. Time after time appeal is made to "the word," a term which had already become so conventionalized as to be used without any adjuncts such as "word of God," or "word of truth." "To be believed is the word, and worthy of entire acceptance that: 'Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners. Now to the king of eons, immortal, invisible, omniscient God be honour and glory eon unto eon: Amen'" (1 Tim. I. 15-17). The quotation comes not far from the commencement of the letter, and the reference to himself interpolated between the first words and the doxology that followed them and motivated by the word "sinners" is a typical illustration of that characteristic of S. Paul's style which I have already described.

The next quotation is from an ordination service. "To be believed is the word: 'If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work'" (1 Tim. III. 1). There was, it would seem, already an "ordinal" with a fixed form of words which was recognized throughout, at all events, the Gentile churches of the Christian world. It is probable that in VI. 11, we have another quotation from the same service. At any rate it is clear that in VI. 15, 16, we find another doxology, possibly part of a hymn or canticle, which is parallel to the doxology in I. 17. "The form" or "formula of sound words" alluded to in 2 Tim. I. 13, may also have been embodied in the liturgy.

In 2 Tim. II. 11-13 we again have a fragmentary quotation from a fixed service: "To be believed is the word: '... for if we die with [Him], we shall also live with [Him]; if we suffer, we shall also reign with [Him]; if we deny [Him], He also will deny us; if we disbelieve He remains to be believed; He

cannot deny Himself.' " Here it is only the second part of a passage which must have been well known to his correspondents that is quoted by S. Paul.

Along with fixed liturgical forms there had grown up a number of words and expressions with a fixed technical sense unknown or unrecognized outside the Christian circle. One of those is the expression "that day," meaning the Last Day, which occurs more than once in the Pastoral Epistles.

All this implies a later period in the history of the Gentile Church than that at which the book of Acts suddenly breaks off. It is in many respects a new world to which we are introduced. There is no longer the belief that the second coming of our Lord is in the immediate future; Christianity has ceased to be regarded as a sort of offshoot of Judaism and the Roman official has already begun to look upon it as a separate and more dangerous form of religion. That there was such a second period in the life of S. Paul is testified by contemporaneous evidence. Clemens Romanus—S. Clement of Rome—states explicitly that the Apostle was able to carry out his cherished desire to carry the Gospel to Spain and the western border of the Roman Empire; and S. Clement was not only his younger contemporary, but also a resident in Rome. That the first Epistle to Timothy was written by S. Paul is expressly stated by Irenaeus and Irenaeus was acquainted with Polycarp, the friend of Ignatius, whose birth is placed by Lightfoot about 40 A.D., less than ten years after the death and resurrection of our Lord. Polycarp himself was martyred at the age of 86, so that he must have been born shortly after the death of Nero. It is true that Marcion, who formed the first collection of the Epistles of S. Paul, did not include in it the Pastoral Letters; early Christian writers ascribe this to his heretical opinions, but it is more natural to suppose that, written as they were to private individuals, he was unable to obtain copies of them. He failed to obtain copies even of all the Apostles' circular letters; at all events we know of one at least which has not come down to us, and it is possible that the last four verses appended to the Epistle to the Hebrews belong to another which has been lost.

The authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles is thus vouched for by a continuous tradition. And it is not only in secular history that the truthfulness of tradition has been vindicated by the discoveries of modern scientific ar-

chaeology. Recent discoveries at Rome have shown that early Christian tradition also is as trustworthy as early tradition has been proved to be elsewhere. It is only last winter, for instance, that excavations under the mediaeval church of San Sebastiano have confirmed the old tradition that the bodies of the Apostles S. Paul and S. Peter were removed from their original resting-places during the Valerian persecution (A.D. 258) and secretly buried at the bottom of a well in a catacomb above which the church of San Sebastino now stands. Below the floor of the church have been found the remains of a basilica built probably in the reign of Constantine, and under that again the rooms of a private house from the dining-room of which a stair descended to a catacomb containing Christian sarcophagi. A long passage led from this to a niche-like chamber by the side of a well, the walls of the passage being covered with the inscriptions of devout pilgrims who at the end of the third century came to pray beside the bodies of the two Apostles after partaking of a "refrigeratio" or "agape" in the dining-room above. We can no longer, therefore, refuse to believe that the bodies removed by Constantine from San Sebastino to his new basilica in the Vatican were really those of the two Apostles and that consequently they still rest in the sepulchre that he made for them under what is now the floor of St. Peter's Cathedral.—*Bibliotheca Sacra*.

* * *

A Life Giving Message

ROMANS i. 16

By the Rev. M. T. Sorrell

- I. The Service of the Message—from God.
- II. The Nature of the Message—the power of God.
- III. The Purpose of the Message—salvation.
- IV. The Scope of the Message—everyone.
- V. The Realization of the Message—by faith.

* * *

If we "admit" Christ as Lord, "submit" to Him in everything, "commit" everything to Him, and "permit" Him to be everything, and to do all His will in us, then we shall indeed "transmit" His life and grace to others, and all that we are and have and do shall be to the glory and praise of God.—*W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D.*

Immortality

By Newell Dwight Hillis, D.D., LL.D., Brooklyn, New York



FAITH in the life immortal helps men endure the limitations and incompleteness of their lives. Observation and experience assure us that this world is a school-room for the development of an appointed gift rather than for the performance of the work itself. Schools and colleges develop capacity—afterwards comes the life work. It is style that turns the raw silk of knowledge into the brocade of literature. Robert Louis Stevenson was willing to spend a full morning perfecting half a dozen sentences. Preparatory to his life work, Stevenson practised upon his style through twenty volumes of short stories, essays and poems. At 45 years of age he felt that he was ready for his first big novel, but suddenly death withdrew the artist from the scene. The same principle holds in the realms of music, painting, sculpture and invention. Men toil all their lives long trying to master the chosen task. Not until the evening shadows fall and the day is far spent does the amateur become an expert.

Now if the eager and noble student falls asleep in death and wakens in life's morning to take up the tool where it was dropped and to begin the task afresh, using the capacity developed here, in a glorious arena there, then this brief sleep named Death becomes reasonable, and dying is going away to work under better conditions. No man of genius, who has passed through the experience of Stevenson or Pascal, of Scott or Wordsworth, has ever doubted the life immortal. It seems irrational that the mind of Bacon, with his advancement of learning; Newton, with his principia; Handel, with his musical scores, could explode like a brilliant meteor and fall into fire sparks, quickly extinguished. "It is incredible," cries Tennyson, "that man is not immortal. That would be for a just God to deceive His Children!" But if the body falls in physical death after the fashion of the flower that drops off that the fruit may swell, then physical death becomes reasonable and a logical necessity.

In September, autumn finds the whole land waving with harvests. Then summer plumps all the seeds, ripens the kernels, sweetens the grapes, and the honey cells in the hives overflow with trasure. Suddenly the wind turns north, down goes the mercury, the angel of the frost enters the scene and blackens every flow-

er and cuts down every green stalk. Soon desolation is upon the land. But the farmer is not disturbed. He knows that the destruction is seeming and not real and that when the appointed time is come things that seem dead will waken from their sleep.

It is the faith of immortality that recovers man's sense of justice. Here and now it is quite certain that vice and crime often escape unpunished while righteousness and truth go unrecognized and unrewarded. Every day exhibits some man who illustrates prudent passion. He stops just short of the danger line. He thinks that what is legally right is morally right. He hires attorneys to show him how to evade capture and the noose and still roam at large. Profligates also there are who never go too far, and make an art of not jading the delicate nerves of the physical senses. Observation shows that many men have escaped punishment here and carried away the fruits of their thefts, their lawlessness and their crimes. The judgments of men are as imperfect and crude as the judgments of courts. Jesus is crucified, but Pontius Pilate washes his hands in a basin of spring water, rides home in his chariot and lives and dies in his palace. The rich judges of Athens condemned their noblest citizen to death and returned to their banquets and never gave the dying victim a passing thought.

Many a man has betrayed his convictions, played politics, bought and sold offices and honor, and dying, has been borne by multitudes to his tomb, while the benefactors have been hunted and hooted out of life. Martineau once said that "in almost every age which has stoned its prophets and loaded its philosophers with chains, the ring-leaders of the anarchy have been, not the lawless and infamous of their day, but the archons and chief priests and decorous men of God, who could protect their false idols with a grand and stately air, and do their wrongs in the halls of justice, and commit their murders as a savory sacrifice; so that it has been by no rude violence, but by clean and holy hands, that the guides, the saints, the redeemers of men have been poisoned in Athens, tortured in Rome, burned in Smithfield, crucified in Jerusalem. What hero's form therefore can lie quiet on its tomb without fear of the chaplet of honor being chipped from its brow? What reputed monster need despair, after centuries of ex-

ecration, of some biographer to glorify him? For the scourges of mankind have been escorted to death by voices of adulation.

All this, as Martineau urged, argues that man's brief earthly life is the first station in a long eternal career; the first chapter in an unfolding story, before a court that represents Eternal Justice and full Truth. Beyond, therefore, all wrongs shall be righted. Who, therefore, can overestimate the practical uses of Immortality for teachers, unrecognized? For patriots, stung with ingratitude? For just men, who have received neither recognition nor reward? Well might Paul and John Huss and Savonarola, Cranmer, Livingston and Lincoln, exclaim, "If in this life only we have hope, then we are of all men most miserable!"

Many arguments for Immortality have been fashioned upon the needs of man, but the true basis thereof is the necessity of the Father, God. Often we call the roll of the arguments of Cicero, the orator. Broken hearted, after the death of his beloved daughter, Tullia, the Roman lawyer writes out the reasons for a life beyond death, and gives it as his legal conclusion that beyond "there is a meeting place of the dead." Most fascinating are these arguments! The relation between the body, and the soul is the relation between the harp and the singer; the harp breaks down, but the singer turns to select a new instrument. The boat strikes a rock and sinks, but the rower swims to the shore and lives. Accident injures the body, but the soul survives the death of the muscle and bone.

More alluring still the arguments of Wadsworth and Tennyson. Later philosophers, like Fiske, think of the reasonableness of the universe, and the larger fact that man in respect of teachableness, progressiveness and individuality of character, surpasses all other differences that exist in the universe. Co-operative achievements survive for a little time—the coral reef, the cathedral, the city, the civilization—but the personal achievement is individual—an Iliad, an Agamemnon, a Divine Comedy, a Hamlet is a unique birth. And shall Shakespeare never hear the chorus of that great company? Or know that fame began for him, when life had ended? Can a word that is immortal come from a speaker that is ephemeral?

All these are enigmas that cannot be solved, save upon the basis of immortality. The great intellect and the holy saint are necessary unto God, though not to their fellow man. Stolen by gypsies, the little child soon forgets the

palace from which it was snatched, but, does the mother forget, in the dark spaces of the night? Do her arms loose their sense of emptiness?

What is the meaning of that novelist, who made the mother, standing at the door of Heaven, wait unwilling to enter Paradise until the boy whom she had lost had arrived to go in to the palace with her? Hours may come to men when immortality ceases to be a thought of joy but rather a thing of terror. In these moods of utter nervous exhaustion we shrink back from endless growth, tireless study, and ask only a dreamless sleep. Later comes the inevitable reaction. Your living again may not be a necessity to you, but what if it is a necessity to the eternal King waiting in his imperial palace? The father and mother cannot be happy until the soldier boy comes home. What if God finds that He must have His children round about Him? Against the day of the boy's return the parents festoon his room, assemble his friends, make ready the feast. It could not be otherwise. And what if eternity itself would be a burden unto God, without His children—God, who makes ready for their return home and stores the palace and makes all things beautiful, all music, all flowers, all fruits, everything noblest in the hero, the statesman and the lover, to report in that storied realm. What a word is this, "And I saw the dead, both small and great, father, mothers, boys and girls, the little ones, standing before God, making ready for the triumphal procession."

An important question arises at this point: What philosopher, or teacher, has regenerated this old bachelor? Has some new book of logic been discovered? No, a thousand times no! Love is an experience. That is what Emerson meant when he said that he had gotten beyond arguments for immortality; "I have experienced it; I do not know about you, but I do know that I am immortal." This tells us why Jesus never tried to prove the existence of God, any more than he tried to prove that there was a sun in the sky, or flowers in the grass. He was so busy experiencing God, loving God, praying to God, obeying God, and enjoying God, that he had no time to argue about God. We are little of stature, and the horizon is nine miles off; Jesus was our tall elder brother, with forehead touching the stars, and he looked over the top of the hill and saw the sweet fields dressed in living green, and all the noble souls and the little children, whom men had loved and lost going through the gardens of Paradise,

and lingering midst the Elysian fields. Placing his hand upon the worn and the weary, the sick and the wistful, with a great sweet smile upon his face, Jesus pointed men upward and whispered, "In My Father's house are many mansions, let not your heart be troubled!"

Many of you today are under the spell of Memory. You long for the "touch of the vanished hand, and the sound of a voice that is still." Questions arise. "Is there a meeting place of the dead? What about those little crosses in Flanders Field, bearing the words 'an unknown hero.'" I saw the dead, both small and great, coming in from all ages and races, and countries and climes, and standing before God. For God's children there is no death. You are not journeying toward a black hole in the waving grass—that is for your body; you are a pilgrim journeying toward a gate of amethyst opening into a wall

of silver. Soon the prisoner shall be released from his dungeon! Soon the invalid shall escape from his pain! Soon the defeated shall find the battle and its fortune turning to victory! You are like unto one who on an ocean steamer amusing himself with books and games, when suddenly the outlines of land appear, and the smell of orchards and harvests is in the air. Clouds begin to be land clouds. Sails appear. In that hour the traveler gives away his books, forgets his games, and with glad excitement prepares to land.

Happy those who have prepared for an abundant entrance. Blessed are they that have sent on in advance a company of celestial pilgrims, who linger about the gate waiting to give tumultuous welcome to one beloved. Thrice blessed, these who come in like some noble king returned from their Holy War on earth's far off frontier.

What John Saw

By the Reverend John G. Reid, Ph.D., Yakima, Washington



JUST now, in certain religio-philosophical circles, an iconoclastic spirit seems to be dominant. First one, then another, of the fundamental doctrines long accepted—the very vitals of the historic, the catholic Apostles' Creed,—such as "His Only Son", "Conceived by the Holy Ghost", "Born of the Virgin Mary", etc.,—is assailed.

In some quarters, in the name of Science and Philosophy, "The resurrection of the body" is now openly questioned. This, of course,—as Paul so clearly saw (1 Cor. 15:13)—involves the reality of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus. Some have not hesitated to accept the logic of their "conclusions" so far as to deny the physical, *i.e.* the real resurrection and subsequent appearance of the physical body of our Lord.

I need not waste my time or that of intelligent readers in establishing the vital, the fundamental importance of this great fact of which Luke assures us in Acts 1:3, and Peter in Acts 10:40; which John took such pains to establish in his Chapter 20, and upon which Paul built his masterly argument in 1 Cor. 15.

"Many infallible proofs" which have satisfied the keenest, the ablest minds of all the centuries from the days of the Apostles to the present, are familiar to all well-informed Bible students. The one herein presented

may not be new: but to such as are familiar with it, its re-presentation will not be unwelcome. As for the rest, it may serve to confirm their faith. Such is the purpose, the hope, and the prayer of the writer.

In Matt. 27:39, we read: "When Joseph had taken the body, he *wrapped* it in a clean linen cloth". The Greek word for "*wrapped*"—*enetulixen*—appears only in Luke 23:53, and in John 20:7, of the same act. It means to "wrap around" as was the usage of the Jews in burial; *i.e.* swathing, rolling tightly a long bolt of cloth about the body and limbs, pinning the arms to the side, winding and re-winding, drawing tightly like a surgical bandage, till the whole assumed the familiar form of a mummy.

Bear this word of Matthew and Luke in mind. Mark uses *eneilesen*, which means to wind as thread upon a bobbin or spool. From similiar customs in the distant past we have gotten our "winding sheet". The customs of Egypt, of the Orient, and of the Jews in the time of Christ, are wellknown and familiar. Our own American Indians in many sections,—some to this day—similarly "*wrapped*" their dead for burial.

John (19:40) uses *edesen*, "bound", the same word as in 11:44—*dedemenos*—"bound hand and foot with the grave-cloths" making it necessary to "loose him and let him go".

In the same verse "his face was bound about—*periededeto*—with the napkin" (*soudarion*). This throws light upon "what John saw" when he "looked in", and later, probably at Peter's exclamation of amazement, "entered, saw, and believed".

Note, further, (John 19:39), "There came also Nicodemus . . . who brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about 100 litras", or about 75 pounds in English weight. This would be in the form of a thick ointment, or (perhaps) of powdered gums. "Then took they the body of Jesus, and *wound* it (like a bandage) in the linen clothes with the spices", i.e. wrapping the spices in with the successive windings or swathings, till the body was encased in a tight roll which in itself would weigh at least 100 pounds beside the weight of the body.

The head and face were "bound about" (John 11:44) with the '*soudarion*' in the same way. Such was "the manner of the Jews to bury".

John, arriving first at the sepulchre, stooped, and looking in, saw in the dim light the linen clothes lying there in place, what appeared to be the body undisturbed, but "not yet did he enter in to the sepulchre". Peter, with characteristic impulsiveness, entering for closer inspection, "beheld the linen clothes lie, and the napkin that was upon his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but *wrapped together*" *entetuligmenon*—the same word, tightly wrapped, like a bandage, "in one place apart by itself". Uttering an exclamation of amazement, he calls to John, who now "went in also . . . and he saw, and believed." What did John see, which warranted the addition "and believed?"

Had the Lord risen as did Lazarus, he would have gone forth as he did and the clothes with him, necessitating a "loose him and let him go." Had the body been stolen by *any* one, it would have been taken as it was,—swathed in its bandages. They would not stop to unroll these. That were a long, tedious process. Had they been unrolled, and left in the tomb, a residual doubt might exist as to the removal of the body, whether by theft or resurrection. But,—the linen clothes were there, and *not unrolled*!

That was the startling fact! There they lay, in place, preserving the form of a body enswathed, but *empty*! The chrysalis of the body of Jesus!

As Peter first saw the form, apparently intact, and, examining it in view of the incred-

ible report which Mary had brought them, discovered no *body* in it, only an empty casing, he realized the impossibility of any human hands removing *any* body from such bandaging without disarrangement.

At his call, the intensity of which must be left to the imagination, John "went in also," saw the same thing, confirmed Peter's conclusion, and believed. Forever thereafter he was positive of a real resurrection of the body.

The body which loving hands had reverently *wrapped* and laid in the tomb, which later could, and did pass through barred and bolted doors, appear and vanish at will *had slipped out of its case*. The napkin,—no small square of linen, remember—not neatly folded, as so often with poetic license pictured, but (still) "rolled up"—*entetuligmenon*—wrapped, as it had been upon his head, and not "lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself."

It was not only the empty sepulchre, but *these details*, that convinced John. The empty tomb alone was not conclusive. It was capable of other explanations. The private vault of a celebrated millionaire was some years ago broken into, the inner doors broken down, the casket broken open, and the body removed. No one suggested a resurrection. The evidences of theft were too plain. Here, however, everything forbade such an explanation.

There was no evidence of haste, no disorder, no disarrangement. Most of all, the empty "casing" retaining the form, forever refuted that silly story of the soldiers prompted by the rulers, to be revamped in "these last days".

This gives a new significance to the angel's "Come see the place where the Lord lay." Not merely "the place where they laid him"—the rocky shelf, unoccupied now as before, but the *casing* in which he lay. As we visualize the scene, and the circumstances, putting ourselves in the place of Peter and John, and add this to other proofs of his real resurrection, can we escape conviction? Shall not we also "see and believe"?

"If Christ be not risen, your faith is vain"—(foolish). "But now is Christ risen from the dead", and "declared to be the Son of God by the resurrection from the dead". We acknowledge as Master, we receive and trust as Saviour, we worship as Lord, no mere man whose body still reposes in some Syrian tomb. But "as it was not possible for him to be holden of it", he burst the bands of death, and came forth victor over death and the grave.

And "Behold! he is alive forever more," and

is "able to save unto the uttermost all them that come unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." And "God hath appointed a day in which he

will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all, in that he raised him from the dead."

Professor Robert Dick Wilson and the Bible

By W. Irving Carroll, D.D., Marshall, Texas



N extended discussion is going on, as everybody knows, in the field of Biblical Criticism, both in England and America; and is especially revived, all anew, since the "pronouncement" by Professor George Jackson, in a front page article in the *British Weekly*, last summer.

May I recite some facts concerning another Professor—Professor Robert Dick Wilson, of Princeton? And then give his pronouncement concerning the integrity and the historicity of the Scriptures?

These facts are, to me, simply amazing, the like of which I do not believe exist in the whole long history of the church.

These facts are assembled from addresses delivered by Dr. Wilson at the Moody Bible Institute at the annual celebration of "Founder's Day" last February. The occasion of these autobiographical references by Dr. Wilson will be understood when we remember that he was speaking to the student body of the Institute primarily, and was doing so in a familiar and unconventional manner.

His Life Decision

"I will tell you how the Lord gave me the opportunity and the time to devote myself now for forty-five years continuously, since I left College, to the one great study of the Old Testament in all its languages, and in all its archeology, in all its translations, and as far as possible everything bearing upon its text and history."

"I had a great many doubts as to the historicity of the Old Testament, not enough to hurt my faith in the Lord, but enough to make me want to settle this question for myself and others."

"I decided to give up preaching, and did it with prayer,"—(He had been doing evangelistic work for a year or two in his very early ministry)—"and consecrate my life to a study of the Old Testament."

His Life Plan

This was when he was 25 years of age, at Heidelberg, Germany. He said, "I calculated

from my family history that I would live to be about 70; so that I would have 45 years to work. I divided the period into three parts. The first 15 years I would devote myself to the study of the languages necessary; for the second fifteen I was going to devote myself to the study of the text of the Old Testament; and the last 15 years for the work of writing out the results of my previous studies and investigations so as to give these results to the world."

His Life Work

"I devoted myself almost entirely to the languages which threw light upon the Hebrew study of the languages bearing upon the Bible, and I determined that I would learn all the new, all the cognate languages, and also all the languages like Persian which threw light upon history, and all languages into which the Bible had been translated down to 600 A.D., so that I could investigate the text of the Old Testament for myself."

"I studied ten hours a day; but, excepting Sundays, for the past forty years, about ten hours a day has been my regulation. I devoted three hundred and twenty days a year to this subject."

"I claim to be an expert!"

His Early Life

"I take naturally to languages. I was exhibited as an infant phenomenon, having learned to read at four years of age. At twelve I took up the study of Latin, and at thirteen got to Greek."

"I took 100% on my entrance to Princeton University in French." "And when in the Seminary, I used to read, just for amusement, my New Testament in nine different languages: one after another every fifteen weeks, a different language every fifteen weeks."

His Scholarship

"I now read Dictionaries as other people read the Bible." For instance, he says this, "I gathered up all the nouns in 'ooth' in the

Hebrew, then in the Aramaic, and then in the Babylonian language."

"I covered all the Kings of Egypt and of Babylon, from the earliest to the latest; the Kings of Assyria and Persia, Greece, Phoenicia, the Arabian and Aramaic kings. I went to the original, and have a monumental work which has been published, and everybody treating of the titles of the Kings of antiquity has to go to that work. And everybody that writes for or against me, uses my own works to get his information."

And he goes on to say: "Dr. Driver says he read forty titles in a translation; and when

I was answering that, I said that I had found 2566 in the originals."

An Expert Critic

"I tell you this that you may know why I claim to be an expert. My 'business' is that of a critic."

And this is

His Testimony

"You can be absolutely certain that we have the text, substantially, of the Old Testament that Christ and the Apostles had, and that was in existence from the beginning."

Is the Modern Mind Really Modern?

By the Rev. W. E. Scofield, Sayville, New York



T must be that there is a modern mind, because so many are talking about it, and declaring that all our religious conceptions must be made to conform with its ideas. There is a sort of fixity about the ideas which the modern mind holds, and by them the old and revered ideas of the past are being tested and rejected.

But one wonders whether the modern mind is really modern. May it not have seized upon certain teachings, and made them into fixed principles, to the exclusion of later discoveries, and newer thought?

It is interesting in reading the autobiography of Dr. W. S. Rainsford to see how firmly he has planted himself upon the philosophy of evolution, and then has made all his theological conceptions to conform with it. With great consistency he has shifted all his views concerning the Bible, Christ, and God, until he can hold them in some sort of harmony with evolution. Meanwhile he clings to his religion, the religion of his evangelical days, even though it is entirely out of harmony with his new theology. He has much to say about the modern mind, and we may conclude that an evolutionary philosophy is one of its characteristics.

The modern mind insists on reconstructing the Bible according to certain critical hypotheses. A Methodist preacher, recently retired by vote of his Conference, insists that he lost his job because he preached views with frankness which, he says, other Methodist preachers hold, but conceal; that he maintains the modern view of the Scriptures, and preaches

it. If one may gather his views from his writings, he rejects every teaching of the Bible which emphasizes God's antagonism to sin, because forsooth, God is good; God never visits his wrath upon men; He never causes pestilences, nor floods, nor wars, nor authorizes men to punish criminals. One wonders what view this preacher with the modern mind has concerning divine providence in this present evil world.

We may conclude, also, from the writings of these two men that the modern mind rejects all the teachings of the church concerning the transformation of life through faith in Jesus Christ. Faith, indeed, is nothing but the endeavor to follow the example set by Christ. For the modern mind there is no reality to regeneration, or the witness of the Spirit. It would seem as if a Methodist with that kind of a modern mind were a sort of theological freak.

The question raised is this: Is the modern mind really modern? By closing the mind in certain directions, by substituting scientific or philosophic dogmatism for theological, has it not ceased to be modern? For the mind truly modern is surely open to knowledge from every quarter.

One wonders why all criticism of an evolutionary philosophy should be so constantly met by the mere enumeration of scientific men who hold it, and by dogmatic assertion of its truth. If we are compelled to accept it we want to be convinced after another fashion. We want the difficulties grappled with and overcome. There they have stood for more than fifty years, and not one of them has been

fairly met. If we must be evolutionists, we want to see evolution presented as an adequate philosophy; not beaten into our heads by intellectual bludgeons. That is an ancient fashion. It is not modern.

The so-called modern conception of the Bible seems to be lingering in the theories of a generation ago, and to have solidified them into a new tradition. It ignores most of the facts which historical and archaeological re-

search have been disclosing for the past twenty-five years. One is astonished at the lack of openmindedness on the part of some public teachers with a large reputation. If the foundations of critical hypotheses crumble beneath a newer learning, then those who continue to live in them are the real obscurantists. There is a modern mind that does not have to throw away confidence in the Bible or in spiritual religion.

The Word Made Flesh--Immanuel

By L. Franklin Gruber, D.D., LL.D., St. Paul, Minnesota



T is night. Shepherds at their posts of duty are keeping watch. All else is still, and the course of nature is continuing the same as always and seems as though it should remain unchanged forever. But lo, a stir, that moves it to its very center! The heavens resound and are filled with glory; the shepherds tremble. "Be not afraid . . . for there is born to you this day in the city of David a Saviour, who is Christ the Lord." It is an angelic message of joy that thrills all heaven, though earth itself may seem unmoved because unconscious of its coming deliverance.

The *Lord is born!* What wondrous mystery! Who can understand! The omnific Word Who spake worlds with all their marvels into being is made flesh and thus Himself becomes a creature! The Infinite assumes the limitations of man! The Eternal imposes upon Himself the relations of time!

Man, fallen man, originally was created in holiness in the image of Deity. Deity now condescends to the likeness of man. The mystery of being is deepened; the value of man is exalted; man's conception of God is enhanced. Well might prophets have veiled their faces and well might angels try to look into this mystery of God incarnate.

But, behold mystery is added to mystery. The incarnate Lord is tempted and suffers in all things as we suffer and are tempted. Though He sins not, He yet bears the curse of sin in that He dies. As God and man inseparably united He ascends to His throne of power. More baffled than ever by these added mysteries!

The Holy Spirit comes and affords more light. For *our* sins, not *His* He died. For our sakes He becomes incarnate. He condescended

to become man that He might lift man to God. His death becomes our life. His humiliation became our exaltation. And, for the redeemed there will be crowns, crowns of righteousness, as co-heirs and co-regents with Him Who continues forever as Son of God and Son of Man.

But, though some light is thus vouchsafed, the mystery of the Incarnation remains no less truly mysterious still. It belongs to those transcendental realities for which human language has no descriptive terms and of which our earth-bound intellects can have no conception. Like John on Patmos, one must needs be "in the spirit" before one could receive even the faintest apocalypse of this mystery of mysteries,—the undoubted key to the solution of all other mysteries. And, perhaps one of the joys of the redeemed in the great hereafter will be the better understanding, even though it be but "in part," of this mystery of the Incarnation, moving them to united song, "Unto him that sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb, be the blessing, and the honor, and the glory, and the dominion, for ever and ever."

* * *

God's Fountain

1. Where. Ps. 36:9.
2. Why. Zech. 13:1.
3. What. Prov. 14:27.
4. Which. Jer. 2:13.
5. When. Rev. 21:6.

* * *

This we may know surly, that no man or woman of the humblest sort can really be strong, gentle, pure, and good without the world being better for it, without somebody being helped and comforted by the very existence of that goodness.—*Phillips Brooks.*

THE SANCTUARY

Christ, the First Fruits

By A. William Lewis, A.B., B.D., Hay Springs, Nebraska

"But now hath Christ been raised from the dead, the firstfruits of them that are asleep."—1 Cor. 15:20.



SPRINGTIME comes every year, but that does not make it any the less interesting. Nature puts on new life and beauty. The cold and barren winter may linger in the lap of spring, but it departs unhonored and unsung. So it is with Easter. The Resurrection of Jesus has been commemorated for nearly 1900 years, and it still is our hope and our joy, bringing to us glad memories and sealing again upon our souls the Glad Tidings of the world's salvation.

While the disciples forgot that Jesus had promised to rise again, the astute Pharisees remembered, and they made every provision to prevent fraud and the theft of the body from the tomb. The Roman Seal was affixed to the new tomb of Joseph; and a Roman Guard was stationed at the entrance. If they went to sleep on guard it meant death. The Roman Law was like that of the Medes and Persians. It must never be broken. The Pharisees left God out of their reckoning. The Angel rolled away the stone and broke the seal, unobserved and unmolested. The Guardsmen were dumbfounded. The women found the Tomb empty. Peter and John entered in and saw the garments of the dead carefully folded and laid aside, as they were no longer needed. Marie Corelli in *Barabbas* imagines that the song birds first took up the joy of thanksgiving. It is certain that the Christians by the millions in every century have continued the jubilant praise. Tradition says that lovely flowers sprang up in the foot prints of the Risen Jesus, as He walked away from the Tomb. Certain it is that all down the centuries beautiful souls have arisen and have done deeds more lovely than flowers, wherever the Risen Christ has been known. "Why seek ye the living among the dead?"

"Speak history, Who are life's victors?
Unroll the long annals and say,
Are they those whom the world calls victors,
Who won the success of the day?
The martyrs or Nero? The Spartans
Who fell at Thermopylae's tryst,
Or the Persians and Xerxes?
His judges or Socrates?
Pilate or CHRIST?"

What is the meaning of Easter? Is it merely an historic fact? Does it really matter to us whether Jesus rose from the dead? We might as well ask, would it have mattered to me if my Mother had died before I was born? Before His death Jesus held that it was essential that He should rise; and He made the definite prophecy that He would rise the third day. If He had been in doubt He would not have risked His reputation and His honor. If He had failed in this, He would have failed to establish His claims to be the Son of God. He could not have proved Himself the Victor over death. This was treated more in detail in the April issue, 1922, of *THE BIBLE CHAMPION*, in the article on "The Resurrection of Christ Inevitable." Further let me say this, Christ's Resurrection meant the fulfillment of all His promises, of which He was the firstfruits, and the pledge.

"The firstfruits" were offered the day after the Passover Sabbath, a token of the whole harvest that was to follow. Jesus rose from the dead, the "firstfruits" of all the resurrection harvest. His victory over death and every human ill was not merely for Himself but for all those that love and follow Him, who share in His life. "I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me". "He that raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also with Jesus". 2 Cor. 4:14.

God illustrated yet further what this meant by the unusual events of the Resurrection morning. "The tombs were opened; and many bodies of the saints that had fallen asleep were raised; and coming forth out of the tombs after His Resurrection they entered into the Holy City and appeared unto many". The full meaning of Christ rising, the firstfruits, passes human understanding.

The resurrection of the human dead is placed beyond doubt. Christ was the "firstfruits". Some men in their vaunted wisdom deny the possibility!

Because of their evil lives some do not want to rise, nor to live in any way after this world. A cannibal chief in Africa said, "There is no life after this life. There must not be. There cannot be". But the fact re-

mains, proved by the words of Jesus, and exemplified by the Resurrection of Jesus, "the firstfruits".

The next question is more difficult for us to answer, "How are the dead raised? and with what manner of body do they come?" . . . We can at least say with Paul, "God giveth it a body even as it pleased Him, and to each seed a body of its own. . . . There are celestial bodies and bodies terrestrial. . . . So also in the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. If there is a natural body, there is also a spiritual body". "Death is swallowed up of victory". These general truths should be satisfactory to us for the present. We can never fully understand until the resurrection is exemplified in our own case.

How was the body of Enoch changed? How was the body of Elijah changed? How was the body of Jesus changed? How will the bodies be changed of those living when Christ shall come again? Paul could say only, "This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality". The modern theory of electrons shows how this is possible, and probable. It takes the ground from under the feet of the old materialists, who said that such changes were impossible. The material atoms are made up of electrons, each of which is like our planetary system in microcosm. Scientists have changed some atoms into others by the rearranging of these electron systems. Our mortal bodies are made up of material atoms in a state of unstable equilibrium; but these electrons will be so readjusted that they will be in stable equilibrium and therefore be eternal. All things are possible with God. Every particle in our body is changed at least every seven years; and yet our body is just as much our own. The natural body will become a spiritual body, perfectly stable; and it will be just as much ours as the body we now have.

The present body is one of limitations and defects, a body of humiliation; but the spiritual body will be a glorious body. The present body in some measure indicates the kind of life indwelling; but the spiritual body will be the perfect expression of the real life. The three disciples on the Mount of Transfiguration knew Moses and Elijah, because they knew about them, and their appearance perfectly expressed their real being. So in heaven we shall know anybody whom we know

about; for their spiritual body will be the embodiment of what they essentially are. So it will be easy to recognize Christ. It will be easy to recognize a Christian, by his resemblance to Christ. Thus the redeemed hosts in Heaven will all resemble Christ apparently, with their own individuality; and thus everyone will be a sincere tribute to Him. Amid the multiplicity of personality there will be a family likeness among the redeemed, all sharing the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. "We look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, Who will fashion anew this body of our humiliation that it may be conformed to the body of His glory". (Phil. 3:20,21.)

* * *

Looking Back

No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God. —Luke 9:62.

I. What the Christian Life Implies.

1. Entire consecration to Christ's service.
2. Difficulties are incident to his service.
3. Compensating grace is promised in his service.

II. What Looking Back Implies.

1. A reflection upon Christ.
2. A preference of the secular to the spiritual.

Therefore look forward and look up. Heb. 12:2.

* * *

Peter's Denial

1. Self confident and Conceited, Matt. 26:33,35. An Achilles' heel in the character of every one.
2. He Failed to Watch. Matt. 26:40.
3. He Failed to Pray. Matt. 26:41, 43.
4. Failing to Watch and Pray, he lost Communion with the Saviour, and was no longer in sympathy with his Purposes and Plans.
5. Out of Communion, he "followed Him afar off." Matt. 26:58.
6. Following afar off, he must have other Companionship, and found it with the Enemies of Christ and Around the Fire. Matt. 26:57,58.
7. His Denial the logical and unavoidable Result of his Previous Course.

FLASHLIGHTS

By Edwin Whittier Caswell, D.D., Middletown, Delaware,

Thine eyes shall see the King in his beauty—
Isaiah 33:17

We shall be like Him and know Him when we see Him as He is. How we have waited for the supreme moment when we shall behold the face of our blessed Master and be filled with his presence. Heavenly recognitions will then be a glorious fact. We will know as we are known; face to face shall we behold Him, where tears of separation are wiped away in the reunions of the Homeland. Jesus will be known in glory as He was after the resurrection. Age nor change cannot touch the unchangeable Christ. What is true of Him will be true of the innumerable company. As the disciples knew Moses and Elijah on the Mount, so we will know and love our own departed, as well as a multitude of the redeemed. In heavenly glory, knowledge will be increased, individuality preserved, personality perpetuated.

When Christ cried at the tomb, "Lazarus, come forth," the spirit of the departed knew the voice of his Lord, remembered his own name and person, rejoined his body, arose to the arms of Jesus and loved ones. He knew them all as we will when all who are in their graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God, calling them to come forth. Myriads of beings will then be filled with the rapture that was crowding the hearts of Mary and Martha at the raising of their brother.

Behold He that keepeth Israel shall neither
slumber nor sleep—Psalm 121:4

Bishop Bashford, in one of his Episcopal tours in China, was one night compelled to sleep out doors, under the trees, the hotel keeper warning him about marauders. Being watchful and wakeful awhile, he thought of these words of the Psalmist, and then said to the Lord, "There is no use both of us being awake," so he slept the sleep of the just. In the morning he saw a watcher standing guard under a tree; the heathen man was helping God guard his own.

When one asked Alexander the Great how he could sleep so soundly in the midst of danger, he replied, "Parmenio watched." So when we lie down to rest and awaken in the morning, we say, "I am still with Him who

giveth his beloved sleep." Jacob at Bethel, resting on a stony pillow, far away from friends and companions, saw the ladder and the angel, and heard the Divine voice saying, "Behold I am with thee and will keep thee in all places whither thou goest." How beautiful it is to know that when we go out to toil and come in to rest, or when we go out of this life into the next, we can say, "My soul, wait thou upon the Lord; He will sustain thee and keep thee. The sun shall not smite thee by day nor the moon by night, for the Lord is thy keeper."

The elders fell down before the Lamb . . . and sang a new song, saying, . . . Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us . . . out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.—Rev. 5:8,9.

The song of the Lamb is God giving himself for his children. It is the loftiest note heaven ever heard, and can never be excelled in the beauty of its holiness or the rapture of its melody; for salvation is the summit of God's union with humanity, from whence all music will radiate through eternity.

This is a song of sacrificial service, of resurrection power, of cleansing blood, and of spiritual baptism. The volume of this praise will swell like the tides of the mighty ocean on the waves of the crystal sea throughout the ages of the forever.

The marks of redemption are upon the Lamb of God and will be the badge of his glory through eternity. His vesture is dipped in blood, which gives him his greatness of strength and makes him mighty to save. He is the great Conqueror, helping us to overcome by the blood of the Lamb. It is the throne of God and the Lamb, not a saint, or a martyr, or an archangel.

Among the many names of Christ are "Son of Righteousness," "Rose of Sharon," "Morning Star," "Elder Brother," and "Redeemer." But "Lamb of God" stands like a keystone in the arch of his wonderful name. O blessed, holy, saving, glorious Lamb of Calvary! We will praise thee; we will adore thee; we will worship thee; we will rejoice to join with the whole universe, singing, "Unto him that loved us and loosed us from our sins by his blood, and made us to be kings and priests unto God, unto him be glory and dominion forever and ever."

Many that are first shall be last, and the last shall be first.—Matt. 19:30

The vast honors bestowed upon the unknown soldier in Paris, London and at the Capital of our nation are a vivid illustration of the words "The last shall be first." Human history has never witnessed such a scene before; all the nations bowing before the bier of an unknown soldier. Heroism is here exalted, instead of any celebrated general in the army.

With Almighty God there is no distinction of race, color, language, or position, for all are one in Christ Jesus. The nations are therefore today following in the footsteps of Christianity, glorifying men who are true and faithful, however humble they may be; rewarding men regardless of wealth, promotions or social distinction. Unknown men, well known by the Heavenly Father, are recognized as brothers in the great family of the Infinite.

The natural man is inclined to regard highly the achievements of distinguished heroes, while the Heavenly Father looks upon the heart, and desires and the intentions. Many will say, "Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in Thy name and done many wonderful works?" while the answer will be, "I never knew you," because of the selfish motives impelling you to service. Should we not seek the good of others, the glory of Christ's kingdom, regardless of our own advancement? Talents of mind or money have not moral significance; without love they will profit nothing. How many have lived a quiet life of patience, self-denial and devotion, unknown to the world, but known by Him Who seeth in secret? They will be crowned by the righteous Judge at last.

Gather up the fragments, that nothing is lost—
John 6:12

One carpet in the San Francisco mint when cremated gave forth five thousand five hundred dollars in gold. Fragments of time, improved, bestow the more precious gold of character. Every day, commonplace opportunities, utilized, grow to greatness. It is not by a single bound, but round by round, we climb to the skies. Our intellectual, moral and spiritual natures develop like the body, by little additions continuous accretions.

Are not many souls dying of starvation, for want of the daily manna of the true, the beautiful and the good. Riches are all around us—O that we realized their nearness!

Instead of hunting for oil indications, gold and diamond mines, we will reach a competency by the little everyday accumulations. Millionaires in God's kingdom know that goodness is of slow growth, but sure to reach the stature of Christ. Neglecting cultivation and thrift brings no golden harvest; no day should pass without its seed sown, its duties done, its fragments conserved. It took ages of development to form the gems in earth's treasure house; so we may add to our faith, virtue and all the qualities of grace till our gems of character shine in the crown of His glory. Let us therefore every day feed the eye with the beautiful, the ear with melody, the mind with truth and the soul with God.

We have a building of God, eternal in the heavens.—2 Cor. 5:1.

The animal and the savage, who are low down in the grade of being, do not mourn long for the dead. "Out of sight, out of mind." As manhood has risen in the scale of being his aspirations and belief in a future life have enlarged. Now, the loss of friends means reunion beyond. The memory of the departed grows brighter as one nears the undiscovered country. We find that we belong to two worlds, the physical and the spiritual, and that we must enter the higher to complete the happiness and usefulness of our being. Christianity means the union of the present and the future—they are really like our Lord's seamless robe, one throughout. Eternity is here in our hearts as well as among the redeemed.

The spray of the Jordan, the baptism of death, makes no change in the purity of the spirit, any more than the crossing of a bridge makes transformation of the passenger. One change there will be in our social surroundings—the wicked will be separated from the good like the tares from the wheat. Man cannot succeed in his fight against God. He cannot even harm or interfere with nature and her laws. Can he bind the sweet influence of the Pleiades or loose the bands of Orion, or stop the flow of the sunlight, or chain the power of gravitation, or control the winds and the seas? Never! Man is a pigmy before the power of the Highest.

Who shall separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord? No human power or creature or devil or things to come will ever move a single child of God a hair's breadth from His bosom.

PRAYER MEETING SERVICE

By A. William Lewis, A.B., B.D., Hay Springs, Nebraska

In certain localities "April showers bring May flowers". May the showers of spiritual blessings in every State bring the flowers and fruits befitting the Easter month. The deadness of winter blossoms into life.

Love Triumphs

Luke 24:1-12

In love for mankind Jesus Christ died and that divine love triumphed in the Resurrection. Everywhere on earth life succumbs to death, flowers, animals, man. Most pleasures are like snowflakes on the river, a moment white then gone forever. Easter brings us the one hope, but all-sufficient. "Why seek ye the living among the dead?"

The Resurrection of Jesus was God's seal upon the truth of His claim to be the Son. He staked everything on this prophecy that he would rise the third day. In love He told them this beforehand. Paul said, "If Christ be not risen, then is our faith vain, and we are yet in our sin". But His rising is the token that divine love triumphed.

Earth's resurrection is beautiful in spring-time; but its life soon fades. It is a passing emblem of the resurrection of the Christ-life in man, which has within it no element of death. It is untouched by death, and has eternal beauty and perpetual youth, joyous, vigorous, glorious. Those having this Christ-life through the indwelling Spirit of God shall never taste of death. Love triumphs for us, as well as it did for Jesus Christ, Who not only died for us, but rose again for us.

The acorn is knocked from its tree. It is trampled under foot and buried in the earth. In the spring it hears the call of life. It pushes aside all obstacles, and grows until it furnishes shade for animals and nesting for birds. It may be made into a boat, that will rescue men from drowning. Such is the victorious life of the Christian, in which love will ever triumph.

"To rise with Christ, it is awaking into the brightness of God's face. It is to see His splendor breaking through every form in every place, as all along the heavenly way unfolds the dawn of His great day".

* * *

George Eliot says: "The Gods have a curse for him who willingly tells another the wrong road."

The Face of Jesus

2 Corinthians 4:1-15

"The glory of God in the face of Jesus"! Have you seen it?

Jesus was the marvel of all the ages. "No man spoke as He spoke". No man lived such a noble, irreproachable life. No man was such a teacher of the truth of man and of God. But we do not really see Jesus Christ unless we see in His face the glory of God.

Jesus was the revelation of God (John 12:44). "The only begotten Son. Who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him". (John 1:18). This letter was written at a time when the peoples had begun to lose faith in their own gods, and in any God. Jesus was the incarnation of God. In Him were embodied all their highest ideals of what God should be. To-day some say we cannot know God; but Jesus says, "If ye had known me ye would have known my Father also". Helium was first discovered in the sun, and then on earth; but it is by the earth particles that we learn more fully the nature of the sun.

"God in the face of Jesus"! This expresses God's personality. Some would deify a principle or a force; but God is a person. More than this, there are three persons in the Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. All are infinite in knowledge and therefore they are always in harmony, knowing absolute truth. Jesus so expressed the personality of the Father, that we can grasp His nature sufficiently, in order to love Him.

"The glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ"! What made Jesus so glorious in His life? His truthfulness, honor, purity, kindness. These too are the glory of the Father. Think too of His wisdom and power and goodness. "The pure in heart shall see God".

It is possible for us to have something of this glory in our life. "Be ye therefore imitators of God as dear Children".

* * *

Do not let the devil cheat you out of your inheritance.

Broadcasting Life

1 Timothy 4:1-16

Jesus used many figures of speech and many illustrations to illumine life, and He showed us how to discover new ones, and understand all parables. Radio affords us a striking metaphor. "Neglect not the gift of God that is in thee", but broadcast your life for the good of humanity.

Few dream of the possibilities of their life. The Indians lived in America for centuries, and yet developed nothing. They chased the buffalo over the plains, and never imagined that under their feet were great coal fields and reservoirs of oil, and fertile soil waiting to be productive. Much as we have done, possibilities beyond our knowledge may be just appearing in the airplane and the electric marvels. So we may have great possibilities in our personal life. We may have great powers for broadcasting life.

H. C. McDowell was a poor colored boy, ignorant, but hungering for knowledge. He went to Talladego College, and to the Seminary. He and his wife have gone to Africa, to Angola, to King Galange, on the west coast; and they are building up another Tuskegee. Eleven hundred met at Christmas to sing carols.

We become a Receiving Station, when we accept Christ, and receive His Holy Spirit into our soul. Then we begin to exploit the supersense of spirituality. We receive guidance directly from God, through His Spirit. Conscience awakes to undreamed powers. We get in tune with the Infinite. Prayer is answered. The Resurrection Life is understood, and it becomes our higher self.

"Take heed to thyself". Build up yourself in love and spirituality. A Broadcasting Station must have a strong battery. By prayer and fellowship, grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. By the study of the Bible learn the rules of the calling and the methods of its best uses. By the exercise of your religious gifts increase them. "Be strong in the Lord".

"Save thyself and them that hear thee". Send forth the saving power. President Harding, Nov. 12, 1921, at Arlington spoke to millions. The Church provides the amplifiers. Through the Bible Societies we may speak to millions the Word of Life. Through the power of the will and prayer, you can make your personality more efficient, and intensify your influence for good. "Stir up the gift of God that is in thee". Get a passion to know

and do the will of God. In all this Jesus is our great exemplar. His spirit will make our love effective.

Faith Positive

John 11:1-44

Come with me to Bethany, where Jesus loved to visit, after the toil and the distraction of Jerusalem. It is just over the brow of Olivet. It was the home of Mary and Martha and Lazarus. But Lazarus was now dead. While Jesus was up north he had been taken very ill, and soon died. Now Jesus had returned, and the two sisters were both at His feet, in wondering submission, and in unnamed hope. Jesus said, "Thy Brother shall rise again". "Believest thou this?" Now He was about to raise Lazarus who had been dead four days. They were at the tomb. "Take ye away the stone". Jesus lifted up His eyes and said, "Father, I thank Thee that Thou hearest me. And I knew that Thou hearest me always". What faith!

That was a wonderful prayer. Faith positive! Faith not waiting for an answer! Faith giving thanks before the answer came! It was just like Jesus. We too may have such a triumphant faith. I have personally often felt that God had answered, tho' the answer had not materialized. The peace and joy not of earth in the soul give us a pledge from God, and we can say, "I know that Thou hast heard me. I thank Thee".

Jesus believed that the Father answered prayer. Surely He that sitteth in the heavens must laugh, when some men say God cannot answer prayer, for He would violate Nature's laws! Such infidelity is the height of folly. Even man can use nature's laws to serve his own purposes, and thus honors both nature and her laws. It is a law that water runs down hill; but just as much runs upward, in vapor and in vegetation. We have birdmen. The earthly father can answer the prayers of his children physically and mentally. How much more can God, and does God!

Millions know that God does answer their prayers. He is ever near and ready to answer. Nothing is too big for Him, and nothing is too small for Him. It is an insult if we neglect His promises. Let us cultivate the positive faith of Jesus. "I know Thou hearest me always".

* * *

I should be sorely afraid to live my life without God's presence, but to feel he is by my side just now as much as you are, that is the very joy of my heart.—Tennyson.

LIBRARY TABLE

Review of Recent Books

By Professor Leander S. Keyser, D.D., Springfield, Ohio.

Personal and Practical Christian Work. By T. C. Horton. Biola Book Room, 536 South Hope Street, Los Angeles, Cal. \$1.50.

The author is the versatile, consecrated and spiritually gifted superintendent of the Bible Institute of Los Angeles, California, of which Dr. R. A. Torrey is the dean.

"For forty years," he says in his preface, "it has been my privilege and delight to teach and practice the art of soul-winning." A man who puts it that way must be a winsome, devoted man. You might call his book a thesaurus on the finest art in the world—the art of winning souls for Christ's kingdom. Note its rich contents: Section one deals with doctrines, the Bible, God, man, Satan, etc.; Section two points out the best methods of dealing with different classes of the unsaved; Section three treats of various forms of false belief and shows the best ways to win people from them to the truth; Section four has for its subject "Practical Work," and deals with preaching, conducting services, visitation, Sunday School work, etc. It is a most valuable treatise, a practical handbook of evangelism without the least taint of sensationalism.

Where the Higher Criticism Fails: A Critique of the Destructive Critics. By W. H. Fitchett. The Methodist Book Concern, New York and Cincinnati. \$1.25.

This critic of the critics proves himself too acute for the critics. If they shred the Bible, he in turn shreds them, and does it well. We rejoice in this brilliant book, issued by these particular publishers at this time. In one of his previous books, "The Beliefs of Unbelief," Dr. Fitchett (he is a LL.D.) proved himself a valiant defender of Christianity against infidelity. In the book now under consideration, just issued, he proves himself a no less valiant and capable exponent of true, evangelical Christianity over against the enemies within the Christian camp, who, in the boastful name of "scholarship, are undermining the simple faith of many people. In marked contrast with the sonorous critics, Dr. Fitchett actually believes that the plain man of ordi-

nary intelligence has a right to pronounce judgment on the dicta and results of the Higher Criticism, and that the so-called experts have no monopoly in these matters.

We could give scores of apt quotations from this book to show how acute, logical and epigrammatic the author is; but we refrain, and hope our readers will secure it at once, and judge of its merits for themselves. May we venture to hope that the liberalists will awake from their slumbers and give it their careful attention? The style is clear and engaging; yet it is a closely reasoned work. The author's rapier pierces the joints in the armor of such self-styled "Modernists" as Canon Barnes, Griffith-Jones, Foakes-Jackson, Dean Rashdall, Bethune-Baker, George Jackson, and some of the writers of Peake's Commentary, which is decidedly off on the liberalistic tangent. He proves that if their views are true (which happily they are not), historical Christianity would be destroyed, and we would have no Saviour from sin. This book is too important to be passed by.

The Art of Preaching. By Charles Reynolds Brown. The Macmillan Company, New York City. \$1.50.

Yes, there are ways and ways of preaching. When a person says, "As dull as a sermon," he is wrong; he ought to say, "As dull as a dull sermon." We have heard sermons that produced a profounder impression and moved men to action far more powerfully than any mere show or entertainment that we have ever seen. Dr. Brown is the beloved and gifted dean of the Divinity School of Yale University, and his book comprises the lectures given by him on the notable Lyman Beecher foundation. They are worthy successors of the very best of their predecessors, and have a distinctly uplifting power, being characterized by both elevation of thought and a warm spiritual atmosphere. In the face of all the flimsy criticisms that have been made about humdrum sermons, he declares "that to preach the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ is the highest office and the most alluring interest to which any human being can be called." Dean Brown's book is a vital one. The lucidity of


the style is due to the lucidity of the author's mind.

We came with a shock of surprise and pain upon what Dean Brown says on pages 55 and 56 about the slicing Biblical criticism. With deep regret we must say that we can endorse neither the doctrine nor the ethics inculcated there. Above all, let not our young ministers start out in their career without camouflage of any kind.

America in the Coming Crisis. By J. C. McFeeters, D.D. Address the Author, Parnassus, Pa. \$1.00.

This little book has won us quite. It is a most earnest book. It is "an appeal to Christian patriots to align our country with Jesus Christ for her safety in the next war." Whether it is possible for our government officially to recognize Christ as Saviour and Sovereign, and conduct all her affairs in accordance with His teaching and under His moral and spiritual sway, is a great and perplexing problem, in view of the fact that people of all persuasions have their rights in this country. But one thing is sure—if that were done, we should be a good, happy and prosperous people, and in time would influence all other nations to follow our example. Dr. McFeeter's book certainly is suggestive and enlightening, and makes us fear for the future of our country if she refuses to acknowledge the rulership of Christ.

Additional Book Notes

HRISTIAN people cannot be too grateful to The Sunday School Times Company, Philadelphia, for issuing two more eye-opening booklets: "Paganism in our Universities" (25 cents), by a Recent University Graduate, and "Evolution and the Supernatural" (25 cents), by W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D. The former gives the astonishing revelation that the old pagan Greek spirit is widely prevalent in the class-rooms and campuses of our higher institutions of learning, while the fundamentals of the Christian faith are rejected outright or insidiously undermined. The author gives his actual experiences, reciting many incidents of atheistic and agnostical teaching. The revelations are pitiful indeed. Of course, not all, perhaps not the majority, of university professors teach dangerous doctrines, but far too many of them do, and we hope this book will help to

arouse our people to the religious situation in our schools of advanced learning.

Dr. Thomas has certainly brought forth a solid and convincing argument against evolution in his brochure. He shows most graphically the baleful effects of accepting the theory of evolution on Christian faith and life. In almost every case it makes either infidels or liberalists out of its exponents. Many scientific data are given which prove that the theory cannot be said to be scientifically established; so why should people give up their Christian faith for an unproved theory? Dr. Thomas shows the old faith to be much more rational than the hypothesis of evolution.

The Bible Institute Colportage Association, 826 North La Salle Street, Chicago, have issued the third edition of William J. Bryan's booklet, "The Bible and its Enemies." In spite of the scorn that some of the scientists, and non-scientists, too, have been heaping upon Mr. Bryan, his books have been selling rapidly. Again and again we have seen his book, "In His Image," listed among the "best sellers" at various bookstores. The brochure under review is written in its author's clear and interesting style, and gives cogent reasons in favor of the Bible and against the agnostic, the atheist, the higher critic and the evolutionist. On the latter subject he elaborates, and shows how it has destroyed the Christian faith of many students in colleges and universities. People ought to read this booklet, and read it judicially, and not laugh at Mr. Bryan as a mere "orator." There is no special "oratory" in this book; it is a sane, reasoned and most earnest discussion.

Many of us have for many years known about Dr. Dyson Hague, formerly Canon of St. Paul's Cathedral, London, England, and now a rector in Toronto, Canada, and a lecturer in Wycliffe College of that city. His writings have always been on the right side of the theological question. "The Wonder of the Book," issued by the Evangelical Publishers, 853 College St., Toronto, Canada, is by Canon Hague, and is a most refreshing book on the Bible and its marvelous contents, construction, unity, circulation, interest, language, creativeness, prophecies, and influence. As one reads these cumulative chapters, the greatness of the Bible becomes almost overpowering, and one wants to fall on his knees and thank God for His wonderful Book.

But what a different atmosphere you breathe when you pick up Stuart L. Tyson's booklet, "The Progressive Revelation of the

Bible"! Here the atmosphere is coldly rationalistic, yes, cold and hard as icicles, not warmly spiritual. Of course, if a man regards the Bible merely from the human viewpoint, or at least almost wholly so, he will arrive at Mr. Tyson's conclusions, and will find it without any special authority in anything, even in religion. But suppose you take the book at its own evaluation; then you will see how God inspired its writers and guided the Old Testament Church in forming the Old Testament canon and the New Testament church in forming the New Testament canon. The Bible is a spiritual book, and so the rationalist cannot properly appraise it.

Professor George McCready Price, now head of the department of geology in Union College, College View, Nebraska, has just issued a reprint of an article which appeared in *The Princeton Theological Review* some months ago. Its title is, "The Fossils as Age-Makers in Geology." It is of great value. The author has a different theory of geology from the current one, and he here indicates its main features, and gives cogent reasons for accepting it. If his interpretation of geology is the true one—and to us it seems most reasonable—there is the most beautiful agreement between God's two books, the Bible and the geological record. Dr. Price informs us that he has not had very many copies of his reprint struck off, but some time during this spring his *magnum opus*, "The New Geology: A Text Book for Colleges," will be published. So we shall be on the *qui vive* for this book, which will doubtless cause a mighty stir in the scientific world. Then the public will have a chance to see what the reformed science really is.

Evidently the George H. Doran Company, New York, has taken over several of Philip Mauro's cogent books, and has placed their valuable imprimatur upon them. We note that they are listing and advertising his "Evolution at the Bar," which was reviewed in these columns in the August-September number. These publishers have also sent us Mr. Mauro's invaluable recent book, "The Chronology of the Bible," which we commended with might and main in the December number of *THE CHAMPION*, and which we wish our readers would consult. We give it our unstinted endorsement. The price is \$1.00 net.

* * *

Religions die in order that religion may live.—*Bishop Carpenter.*

A Rash and Foolish Assertion



PROFESSOR Henry Fairfield Osborn is credited in the New York Times with the statement that "the evolution of man from the brute is the most firmly established truth in the Natural Universe."

It is hard to believe that any man with even a smattering of scientific information would make such a statement. No missing link between man and the brutes has been found. Professor Osborn has drawn a picture of what he claims was such a link. A few ounces of bones were assumed to be part of a skeleton. Other bones were imagined to complete a skeleton. This was clothed with imaginary flesh and skin and hair and labeled the link between man and the monkey.

There is no scientific authority for so labeling it. It is no better than the picture a child might draw of the dark side of the moon. Real scientists, almost without exception, say that no missing link has been found. Prof. William Bateson, world-famous English biologist, told the Association for the Advancement of Science, in Toronto a few months ago, that it was impossible for scientists any longer to agree with Charles Darwin's theory of the origin of species. He declared that while forty years ago the Darwin theory was accepted without question, scientists had come to a point today where they were unable to offer any explanation of the genesis of species.

We put this beside the sensational assertion of Professor Osborn. He says, "Man's descent from the brutes is the most firmly established truth in the universe." A scientist who is certainly his equal, and we suppose much his superior, says that "scientists are unable to offer any explanation of the genesis of species." Prof. Bateson believes in evolution, but he distinguishes between evolution as an unexplained hypothesis and the Darwinism theory as a fact, a thing Prof. Osborn does not do.

Professor Bateson follows the scientific method. Science is knowledge. It is based on facts. But there are no facts to justify Professor Osborn's statement that man has been evolved from a brute, or that any species has been evolved from a different species. Such a statement is unscientific, and simply discredits Professor Osborn and throws doubt on any statement he may make touching science and philosophy.—*Herald and Presbyter.*

Our Library Exchange Department

Advertising in this department is exclusively for Bible Champion Subscribers. Only articles used in a Library—Books, Typewriters, etc.—may be offered. Cash must accompany order at following rates: 10c a line for first insertion, and 8c a line for every insertion after first. Count 7 words to a line. Minimum charge 30c per insertion. Remit to Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

NOTE—Where only initials are given in address make money order payable to Bible Champion or order and payment will be forwarded to proper party.

WANTED—Bible Champions January to July, incl., 1913; also April, June, July, 1914; also September and October, 1917. State price and condition. Address E. R. S., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

WANTED—Set Pulpit Commentary, 51 vols., Funk & Wagnals, publishers. Give price and condition. Address O. L. Minnich, Windber, Penna.

FOR SALE—Talmage's sermons, cloth binding, 20 Vols.; Homiletic Review, cloth binding, 30 Vols.; Treasury of Religious Thought, cloth binding, published by E. B. Treat & Co., 22 Vols., and a lot of other good religious books at low prices. List on request. John G. Vance, Union, N. H.

FOR SALE—Set 6 large 8vo. Universal Encyclopaedic Dictionary, good as new, cloth, with total of 4,731 pp; will sacrifice for \$7.50. Also set 10 volumes Six Thousand Years of History, like new, for \$10.00. Also set 20 vols. O. T. Homiletic Commentary, cloth, like new, for \$17.00. All prepaid east of Rockies—west of Rockies add \$1.00 per set toward postage. Address T. U. V., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

NEW BOOKS CHEAP—Fundamentals and their Contrast, *Buckley*, (1.25) for 65c; The Kingdom in History & Prophecy, *Chafer*, (\$1.00) for 60c; Looking for the Saviour, *Mauro*, (\$1.00) for 60c; God's Love & God's Children, *Mauro*, (1.00) for 60c. Beginnings of New England *Fiske*, (\$2.00) for 75c; Chosen of God, *Lathe*, (\$1.25) for 65c; Municipal Reform Movement, *Tolman*, (\$1.00) for 40c; Methods & Principles, *Winship*, (\$1.00) for 60c; The Growth of the Kingdom, *Gulick*, (\$1.50) for 75c; Decision of Character, *Foster* (\$1.00) for 50c; Return of the Lord Jesus, *Torrey*, (\$1.00) for 75c. All postpaid at price named. Address M. N. O., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

NEW BOOKS—These books all cost \$1.50 each. Will sell any one for 75c, prepaid. Scientific Faith, *Johnston*; Paradoxical Pain *Harbin*; The Deathless Book, *Mears*; Progress of Religious Freedom, *Schaff*. The Higher Critic's Bible or God's Bible, *Burns*; Bible Steps unto Heaven, *Carpenter*; Gift of Mind to Spirit, *Kulaner*; Divine Movement in Israel, *Porter*; The Life that Really Is, *Abbott*. Address N. O. P., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

Like New Books—Pronouncing Bible, sheep binding, with Books of Psalms in meter, \$1.25; Origin & History of the Books of Bible, *Stowe*, 8vo., \$1.00; N. T. Annotated Paragraph Bible, 8vo., \$1.00; Platform Echoes, *Gough*, 8vo., \$1.00; Psychology—the Motive Power, *McCosh*, 50c; The Old Way, *Rhoads*, 50c; Bird's Eye View of Life of Christ, 35c; All like new, all prepaid. Address S. L. D., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

WANTED—Copy of Dr. Gregory's "Why Four Gospels." Give conditions and price. Address Frank J. Boyer, Reading, Pa.

FOR SALE—About one half and less. Philosophy of Religion, *Hoofding*, cost \$4.00, for \$2.50; Theology of Old Testament, 2 vols., *Oehler*, \$1.50; Alfred's Greek Testament, 5 vols., \$4.00; Creeds of Christendom, 3 vols., *Schaff*, like new, \$4.00; Systematic Theology, 2 vols., *Miley*, cost \$6.00, for \$3.00, new P. Wiseman, 910 Bank St., Ottawa, Can.

SALE—World's Parliament of Religions, new, 2 vols., morocco, \$3.00. Address J. K. L., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

FOR SALE—Letter Copying Press, perfect condition, like new, cost \$8.00, for \$2.50. Address H. I. J., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

SECOND-HAND BOOKS CHEAP—Prices in parenthesis are what books cost new. 8vo in parenthesis are what books cost new. The Broken Seal, *Green*, (\$1.50) for 35c; *Hamilton's* Mexican Hand Book, Ills., (\$1.50) for 35c; Relations of the Republic and Laws of Religious Corporations, *Kynett*, (\$2.50) for 50c; Christ for India, *Lucas*, (\$2.00) for 50c; *Dewey's* Works, (\$2.50) for 75c. All fully worth price asked. All sent prepaid. Address O. P. R., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

Bible Commentary—Just like new. Lange's on Acts, Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Thessalonians, James, Revelation. Will sell for \$1.50 any single vol., or \$10 for the 8 vols. Prepaid east of Rockies. Address P. R. S., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

New Books Cheap—All Matters Tend to Rotation, *Hamilton*, (\$2.00) for \$1.25; Doubters and their Doubts, *Darling*, (\$1.00) for 50c; Probation & Punishment, *Burns*, (\$1.00) for 50c; Sanctified Spice, *Peters*, (\$1.75) for 40c; Pleasures of Literature and Solace of Books, *Shaylor*, (\$1.75) for 50c; The Listener in the Church, (35c) for 25c; The Yoke, *Piper*, (\$1.50) for 25c; The Counter, *Tenor Voice*, (\$1.00) for 40c; *Wasson's* Religious, Social & Political Essays, (\$1.50) for 75c; Great Books as Life Teachers, *Hillis*, (\$1.50) for 75c; Jonah in Fact and Fancy, *Banks* (75c) for 35c. All prepaid. Address R. S. T., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

FOR SALE—NEW. Christianity's Greatest Peril, *Eckholm*, (\$1.50) for 90c; Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels, *Thorburn*, (\$2.00) for \$1.25; Christ, His Nature and Work, (\$1.75) for \$1.10; The Teaching of Jesus, *Burrell*, (75c) for 45c; Up in Maine, 6th Ed. *Day*, (\$1.00) for 50c; Chat About Celebrities, *Guild* (\$1.50) for 85c; Way of the Preacher, *Kern*, (\$1.25) for 65c; Set Kipling's Stories, 5 vols., in original box, (\$2.50) for \$1.25; Growth of the Kingdom, *Gulick*, (\$1.50) for 75c; Revivals, How and When, *Newell*, (\$1.25) for 65c. Address, S. T. U., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

WANTED—Vols. 1, 2, 3 Bible Student and Teacher—either bound or unbound. Name price and give condition. Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

WANTED—New Standard International Bible Encyclopaedia—Orr, etc. State condition and Price. Martin Sarmast, Monticello Heights, Cynthiana, Kentucky.

NEW RELIGIOUS BOOKS

All sent prepaid at prices named

Contending for the Faith, by Leander S. Keyser, D.D. 8vo. Net, \$2.00. Essays in Constructive Criticism and Positive Apologetics. This able defence of orthodoxy will be sure of a warm welcome by all Christian students who recognize the importance and need of such a book as this, that calls with a voice of authority and conviction to a renewal of belief in the "faith once delivered."

One Thousand Evangelistic Illustrations, by Rev. Aquilla Webb, D.D., LL.D. Cloth, Oc., net \$3.00. President Mullins in his "Introduction" says, "I know of no collection equal in range and variety and forcefulness. It is a notable service to the cause of evangelism to prepare a volume of illustrations which the evangelistic preacher may keep at hand for the reinforcement of truth. Public speakers will find here a treasure house of illustrative material."

Farrar's Life of Christ. New Edition. Cloth. Oct. Net, \$3.00. This great life of the Master will always be counted as a classic. It should be in every Bible Student's library.

Smith's Dictionary of the Bible. New Edition. Oct., Cloth, with many illustrations and maps. Net, \$3.00. A reprint of one of the most widely used and popular editions of this great book. It is doubtful if any other Bible Dictionary can ever supplant Dr. Smith's monumental and scholarly work for the use of the average Bible Student.

The Gardens of Life, by Rev. John Roach Straton, D.D., author of "The Menace of Immortality," Cloth, 12mo. Net, \$1.50. In contrast to his former volume of "Messages of Wrath and Judgment," Dr. Straton has gathered into this new book of sermons a series of "Messages of Cheer and Comfort," which will be found as beautiful and inspiring as his other discourses were electric and powerful.

How to Advertise a Church, by E. E. Elliott. 12mo. \$1.50. In this very practical and suggestive handbook the author tells how, when and where to advertise each department of the church and Sunday school.

The Life and Epistles of St. Paul, by Coneybeare and Howson. New Edition. With Maps and Illustrations. Cloth. Oct. Net, \$3.00. This monumental work on the great apostle and his writings will always remain a standard and indispensable book for the Christian Student's library.

Heralds of a Passion, by Rev. Charles L. Goodell, D.D. Cloth. 12mo. Net, \$1.50. Dr. Goodell maintains that everything great in life is a passion, and religion being a life must be impassioned. The symbol of our religion is a Cross, and He who hung upon it was a man of infinite passion. We are to be heralds of that passion. How can we be heralds of it, if we do not feel it? In many quarters the Church seems to have lost the fine flavor of its early rapture. In some way we must win back that early enthusiasm. The author shows the passion which was upon the hearts of the prophets, the apostles and the reformers. The book is a passionate appeal to ministers and laymen to give themselves without stint and with infinite yearning to the salvation and service of men.

The Practice of Christ's Presence, by Rev. W. Y. Fullerton. Cloth, 12mo. Net, \$1.00. The fourth edition of a "new and revised edition" of this modern "Practice of the Presence of God." Dr. Alexander Whyte said of it "This is a masterly book. It is the simple truth to say that it ranks beside Brother Lawrence's book and Jeremy Taylor. I have gone back to Brother Lawrence's book only to return to Mr. Fullerton's with greater appreciation, benefit and delight."

Revival Sermons, by Gipsy Smith. Cloth, 12mo. Net, \$1.50. These sermons by the world famous Evangelist were preached in America during his visit in the spring of 1921. They represent the Gipsy at the very zenith of his powers. Tens of thousands who have heard him will wish to have this permanent record of his eloquence and heart-reaching appeal. The book will bear his wonderful gospel message to thousands who have not and may never hear him.

Prayer and Praying Men, by Rev. Edward M. Bounds. 12mo. Net, \$1.25. The author of "Preacher and Prayer" has in this volume given us a new insight into the spiritual life of the praying men of the Bible. From Abraham to Paul he covers in his own inimitable way the history of prayer in the Holy Scriptures.

The Book of Personal Work, by John F. Faris, D.D. 12mo. Net, \$1.25. Doctor Faris has gathered in this inspiring volume a series of concrete instances of soul winning. They will fire imagination and generate the "Will to Save." Indispensable to ministers, evangelists and Christian workers in illustrating addresses.

The Training of the Twelve, by Alexander Balmain Bruce, D.D. 8vo. Net, \$2.00. This great work of Dr. Bruce's has long been recognized as the standard on the personality of the Apostles and the teaching they received.

Reunion in Eternity, by Sir W. Robertson Nicoll, M.A., LL.D. 12mo. Net, \$1.50. "A strangely valuable record of Christian thought upon the character of the life beyond death. Illuminated throughout by Sir Nicoll's wide acquaintance with literature."—*The Times*.

The Redeemed Family of God, by Rev. J. H. Jowett, M.A. 12mo. Net, \$1.25. This great spiritual leader finds in the first and second Epistles of Peter full directions for the attitude of the Christian to all the relations of domestic life. This is Dr. Jowett at his best, the poetry of spirituality blended with a practical knowledge of life in all its aspects.

The Importance and Value of Proper Bible Study: How properly to study and interpret the Bible, by R. A. Torrey, D.D. 12mo. Net, \$1.25. This book is designed to impress the reader with the importance and value of Bible study—to enable busy men and women to derive the most benefit from their Bible study and to set forth the fundamental principles of correct Biblical Interpretation.

Address FRANK J. BOYER, Publisher, Reading Pa.

This is what an old professor living in New York says about Boyer Hose: "The socks I get from you are a comfort. Boyer goods are first-class. They are better, far better, than those purchased for me by my wife, at a higher price, in this city."

A Frank Talk on Hosiery

WE STAKE OUR REPUTATION ON OUR LINE OF HOSIERY

Our Hosiery will stand the acid test. Our new line is now complete. We know we can please you both in quality and price.

NOTE OUR FOUR GRADES MEN'S SOCKS

No. 70—Best Peeler Yarn, Re-inforced double Heel and Toe, Lisle finish, all year round weight—a sock made to wear. Black and Colors. Sizes 9 to 11½.

6 pairs, \$1.25; 12 pairs, \$2.25, prepaid.

No. 75—All year round weight, Fine combed Cable-twisted Lisle Cotton, Re-inforced double Heel and Toe, 200 needle—a Dressy, Durable Sock. Black and Colors. Sizes 9 to 11½.

3 pairs, 90c; 6 pairs, \$1.75; 12 pairs, \$3.00, prepaid.

Our No. 77 is a distinct Summer Hose—looks like silk but will outwear several pair of silk. Try a small order.

No. 77—At last we again offer this attractive Sock, made as it was made before the war—a perfect, semi-full fashion, seamed back, Tram Silk and Art mixed—the best combination silk made for wear—extra fine gauge; nothing more attractive at any price. Its wearing qualities will surprise you. Black and colors. Sizes 9 to 11½.

3 pairs, \$1.65; 6 pairs, \$3.25; 12 pairs, \$6.25, prepaid.

No. 80—Black with White Split Foot, Drop Heel that will not show when low shoes are worn, no seam across toe—specially recommended for Tender Feet. Greatest value we know of for all year round wear—we know of no hose to equal it. Only Black with White Soles. Sizes from 9 to 12.

3 pairs, \$1.25; 6 pairs, \$2.40; 12 pairs, \$4.50, prepaid.

LADIES' HOSE—THREE GRADES

No. 5—Select Peeler Yarn, Re-inforced Heel and Toe, Elastic Ribbed Garter Top, Fine Gauge, medium weight—a Reliable Hose, fully worth its cost. Black and White colors. Sizes 8½ to 10.

6 pairs, \$1.50; 12 pairs, \$2.75, prepaid.

Our No. 25 is a distinct Summer Hose—looks like silk but will outwear several pair of silk. Try a small order.

No. 25—Very attractive Ladies' High Grade Mercerized Lisle Hose. While having the appearance of Silk Hose one pair of No. 25 will outwear several pairs of Silk Hose. Has Front Drop Stitch for low shoe wear, strong Garter Top/Double Sole and Double Heel and Toe, Fine Gauge, Semi-Full Fashion, with Seam Back. Sizes 8½ to 10.

3 pairs, \$1.65; 6 pairs, \$3.25; 12 pairs, \$6.25, prepaid.

No. 60—Black Beauty—Possesses unusual wearing qualities, and has an unusually Elastic Garter Top, is Semi-Full Fashioned, made from carefully selected yarn, High Lustre Ribbed Hose, knit with Triple Thread Heel and Toe. Extraordinary value. Black only. Sizes 8½ to 10.

3 pairs, \$1.65; 6 pairs, \$3.15; 12 pairs, \$6.00, prepaid.

Sample Box Men's Socks, 8 pairs—2 each Nos. 70, 75, 77, 80—\$2.60.

Sample Box Ladies' Hose, 6 pairs—2 each Nos. 5, 25 and 60—\$2.50.

Important. Good Hosiery are often condemned because a size smaller than should be worn is ordered; always order fully large in size or foot.

If shipment is to be forwarded insured add 3c for any amount ordered below \$5.00; and 5c for any amount above \$5.00.

BOYER MANUFACTURING CO., Reading, Pa.

OUR BOOK BARGAIN COUNTER

Good Books at half price. A bound in Cloth. A perfectly new

CHRISTIANITY AND POSITIVISM

By JAS. McCOSH, D.D., LL. D., Pres. Princeton College. 12 mo., 370 pp., \$1.75

Special Price, 75 cents, prepaid

"The thinking is generally so clear, and the style so animated and luminous, that any person of average intelligence and culture may understand and enjoy the discussion; and no such person who has begun to read the work will be likely to rest satisfied till he has finished it. This book grapples directly with the vital questions. Every reader must admire its fairness."—N. Y. Independent.

PIVOT WORDS OF SCRIPTURE

By REV. PHILIP B. POWER, M. A. 353 pp., \$1.50

Special Price, 65 cents, prepaid

A pivot being a small point on which something else turns, the title of this volume seems to be very descriptive of those little words of Holy Scripture upon which turns the actual interpretation of a passage, and to which we are indebted for some of the most powerful teachings of God's word, whether they relate to His mercy or His wrath, as in cases of "for," "through," "yet," "then," "but," "and."

"It is pointed, crisp, fresh, and dealing with live issues."—Christian World.

CHRIST AND HIS RELIGION

By REV. JOHN REID, 12 mo., 311 pp., \$1.50

Special Price, 65 cents, prepaid

Not an ingathering of threadbare suggestions, but a mine of fresh nuggets within the reach of all. There is a combination of depth of thought and simplicity of expression.

"Keen and clear conception of truth mark this volume. The author is a man of thought, and his calm and well-balanced views give a charm to his writing. There is a strength of truth in every page."—Christian Union.

VOICES OF THE SOUL ANSWERED IN GOD

By REV. JOHN REID, 374 pp., 4th Edition, \$1.50

Special Price, 65 cents, prepaid

The soul needs a way to reach God, a way to become holy, a way to become happy. Hence the book is divided into three parts; it shows how the wants of the mind can be met in a Redeemer, Restorer, and Satisfier. Meditation must come first, then restoration, then satisfaction.

"That the soul of man can find its hopes realized, its want satisfied, its fears quieted and its measures filled in God alone, is the leading thought of this calm and powerful book. The presentation is most serious, original and suggestive."—N. Y. Observer.

ART AND MORALITY

By WASHINGTON GLADDEN, D.D.

Price, 25 cents, prepaid

A frank treatise by this popular author on Art as that portion of man's work which is inspired by the love of beauty. Not all the beautiful actions of men can be called artistic, but the author insists that the artist who deals with human life shall not divest himself of his humanity; and that he shall not conceal his sympathy with goodness and purity and honor.

"Sterling in sense."—West. Christian Advocate.

"A thoroughly instructive and readable volume."—United Presbyterian.

CONCESSIONS OF LIBERALISTS TO ORTHODOXY

By DAN'L DOCHESTER, D.D. 344 pp., \$1.50

Special Price, 65 cents, prepaid

This work was originally prepared as a course of lectures, and was delivered before the School of Theology of Boston University. It is worthy of all commendation for the extensive research shown by the author, and the presentation of the three cardinal topics: The Deity of Christ, the Atonement, and Endless Punishment.

"A rich army for offensive and defensive warfare against theological error."—Religious Herald.

"The doctor's style is singularly pure and candid, and the diction and dignity, scholarship and research is manifest in every page."—West. Christ. Advocate.

FEATHERS FOR SHAFTS

OR READINGS IN THE BOOK. By J. BERG ESEN-WEIN, PH.D., LITT.D. Beautiful cloth, with gold design on side. 50 cents.

Special Price, 35 cents, prepaid

Choice Bible Reading by the author, assisted by leading American Bible Students: James H. Brookes, D.D., W. J. Erdman, D.D., Albert Erdman, D.D., Pastor D. M. Stearns, D. L. Moody, J. Wilbur Chapman, D.D., C. H. Yatman and many others.

"The Bible Readings are diversified and comprehend most of the principal subjects claiming the attention of Christian people."—Christian World.

"Especially useful to persons who wish to conduct public Bible Readings or studies in the word of God in the social meeting. Get it."—Conference Herald.

"I WILLS" OF THE PSALMS

By REV. PHILIP B. POWER, M.A. 404 pp., \$1.25

Special Price, 65 cents, prepaid

This devotional volume inspires Faith and Trust in time of need; is filled with forceful illustrations; is destined rather to suggest than to teach, though it does both. It is an elaborate treatment of the "I Will" of Trust, "I Will" of Power, "I Will" of Action, and the "I Will" of Praise. Written in very attractive manner, sympathetic and solicitous, by one devoted to the office of ministering to the Saints. A book for the library, the home, the study table, being the determination of the man of God, as found in some of the "I Wills" of the Psalms.

"It is a real mine of suggestiveness."—Churchman.

THE HUMAN FLOWER

A simple statement of the Relation of Sexes.

By ELLIS ETHELMER

Cloth, 12 mo., 50 cents, prepaid

Julia McNair Wright, the well-known authoress, says: "The book, in chaste, elegant, clear, simple, thorough fashion, treats of animal, especially human, generation and birth, giving the subject the same clear, pure dignified treatment hitherto reserved for that other half of biological study, the study of plant life. This book teaches the parents much that parents do not know and have to teach the child. It is a book to be in every home, and in plain sight."

"A delicate subject is dealt with in a plain, straightforward way, but without the slightest coarseness."—Glasgow Herald.

"Pure, strong and true; a book to be welcomed by parents."—N. Y. Christian Advocate.

Address FRANK J. BOYER Reading, Pa.